

THE QUARTERLY JOURNAL OF PUBLIC SPEAKING

JULY, 1916

ACTION AND EMOTION IN SPEAKING

F. H. LANE

University of Pittsburgh

AS TEACHERS of Public Speaking we are bound to realize that action and emotion are closely related. We know that pleasurable experiences manifest themselves in large expansive movements and that painful experiences reveal themselves in shrinking movements. There needs no psychologist come from the laboratory to tell us that each emotion has its characteristic motor conditions. We must know too from our study of speakers and from our observation of students that as a general rule men who feel deeply on a subject express themselves by abundant gesticulation, unless they keep a tight rein upon their emotions. The trait is, of course, not merely individual, it is national and racial as well. Lord Curzon says that the foreigner who is accustomed to see the legislators of his own country rush up and down the stage and throw their arms wildly about, is astonished to behold the calmness of the English Parliamentarians.

I believe that the public speakers may pass through three stages with reference to emotional expression and that different ages and different races probably pass through the same three stages. Of course, when we come to consider nations and periods we must look broadly at the drift of things.

I will start the discussion by reference to three examples. I know rather well the little four and a half year old daughter of one of my colleagues. She tells the story of Lot's wife with abundant action and interesting variation. When she refers to the many, many wicked people and cities, she spreads out her hands, and when

she comes to the place where Lot's wife looks back, her face becomes animated, her whole body expresses enthusiasm, and she lifts her hands above her head and exclaims, "And Lot's wife was turned into a pillar of butter." Her mother had told her the incident simply and had not even hinted the gestures to her. She had perfect self-forgetfulness and abandonment, not because she was thinking of Lot's wife, for she hardly understood a word of the story, but because she was expressing her own emotion.

My second example is that of a man who is the author of a number of books and who often makes speeches. Some years ago I had the fortune to hear him address a college audience and to learn how the students regarded what he said. His whole body was active, his arms jerked, he shrugged his shoulders, he brought his hand frequently to his mouth, he stood awkwardly and leaned on the desk,—almost any action that had no particular connection with what he was saying. When he had finished speaking, the students cheered him to the echo, but when they talked among themselves, they referred to the address as a "Fourth of July affair," and the senior who was to report it to the college paper declared that it was so incoherent that he could see little but idiosyncrasies and bits of personal vanity. It appears that self-consciousness and egotism may do something to obscure a speaker's theme.

As a third example I refer to a man who makes two or three speeches a week to somewhat varied audiences. When I mentioned my present subject to him and asked him what he thought of the theme, he replied that he himself used no gestures. I jokingly reminded him that he was not properly energized. I hastened to add, however, that the themes on which he was speaking were largely such as appeal to what William James calls the finer emotions and that the prompting to action was not so strong as in the case of the coarser emotions. Further I told him that I was using action in its broadest significance. In the term I included the frown, the smile, the flash of eyes, and the change of bearing. And then I told him that I should have to contradict his statement that he used no gestures, for I had often seen him use the more quiet forms of action. His speeches are always well organized, logical and symmetrical; one might almost say that he plans addresses as Tybalt fights,—by a book in arithmetic, one, two, three, and the idea in your bosom.

In these three examples we have progressed from much feeling and frequent action with little thought to deliberate plan and perfectly controlled action of a subdued character. Of course, some speakers never get beyond the first stages, but do not many speakers pass through the development which I have sketched in these instances?

Let us look at the question first from the point of view of the stage. William James tells us that any voluntary cold-blooded arousal of the so-called manifestations of a special emotion should give us the emotion. Again, "The simulation of an emotion," says Darwin, "tends to arouse it in our minds." "There is reason to suspect," he says further, "that the muscular system requires some short preparation or some degree of innervation before being brought into action." This principle, laid down by the psychologist and scientist, has been followed by a number of actors in anticipation of some of their great scenes. Among those who adopted this method are Macready and Baron. The noted French actor of the early part of the 18th century prepared himself in this way before going on the stage in a scene of great excitement. "Il se battait les flancs pour se passionner; il apostrophait avec aigreur et injurait tous ceux qui se présentaient à lui, valets et camarades de l'un et de l'autre sexe." Macready had much the same practise. When he was playing *The Merchant of Venice*, he was in the habit of shaking a ladder violently in order to prepare himself for the dramatic scene with Tubal. Mr. Archer tells of a player who aroused himself by beating the property man. I will digress enough to finish this incident. It was understood that the actor would apologize after the conclusion of the drama and give the fellow a shilling for his pains. One night there was a poor house. In the wings the property man stood waiting for the ordeal, but the actor shook his head and whispered, "Not tonight, my good fellow, the treasury won't stand it." I cannot think that this kind of action for the purpose of arousing one's self for a scene of excitement is desirable even for the stage.

"It is difficult," admits James, "for us to produce in cold blood the total and integral expression of any one emotion because the number of parts modified is immense. We may catch the trick in the voluntary muscles, but we fail in the skin, glands, heart, and other viscera." If the actor fails to get a proper coöperation of all parts concerned, he is too likely to present a scene "full of sound and fury and signifying nothing."

We know, however, that many players follow another and what seems to me a better method. They wait in the wings to receive their cue for entrance, and follow intently the development of the scene of which they are soon to become a part. It is said that Mrs. Siddons while behind the scenes fixed her mind on those disastrous events which call forth the mingled feelings of wounded friendship, disappointed ambition, and maternal tenderness as she appears in the third act of *King John* and exclaims,

"Gone to be married! Gone to swear a peace!"

The mere contemplation of those distressing circumstances, without the aid of any mechanical action as a preparation, awakened in her the appropriate spirit and enabled her to present what the critics considered a magnificent impersonation. Furthermore, concentration of thought upon the character and events seems to be the method of Forbes-Robertson. "When working in earnest," he says, "I admit only two strata: one stratum, the part, the creature I am for the time; the other, that part of my mind which circumstances and surroundings compel me to give up to all things coming under the head of mechanical execution." When you see him in *Hamlet*, you know he plays with emotion but you realize that he always retains the power of guiding and correcting the feeling whenever it grows too impetuous. As I think of the beauty of his impersonation of the Prince of Denmark, I am inclined to doubt that an actor, rousing himself for the tragic scenes by the means used by Macready and Baron, could produce on a modern audience that hears Shakespeare the abiding impression that Forbes-Robertson leaves upon the mind. His action at the burial of Ophelia in comparison with that of any actor that I have ever seen in this part is markedly subdued, but the restraint not only does not detract but it enhances the profound effect. The theatre is the place where we expect action more than we do in the speaker, but even here we are coming to reverence that actor who in the very "torrent, tempest and whirlwind of his passion acquires and begets a temperance that gives it smoothness."

Has there not been a similiar development in the history of Public Speaking? When we turn back the pages to the earliest times, we find that the orations are characterized by strong feeling and doubtless they were accompanied by the free action that goes with emotional experience. Men talked about themes which sprang up out of what James calls the coarser emotions. They addressed

the public less frequently than modern speakers, but they spoke on such vital subjects that the primary emotions were stirred. At the time of Corax speaking must have been in a childlike stage. Men spoke for the rightful possession of houses and land. Oratory was a practical art. When Cicero was at the height of his power, the purpose of speaking had changed. It was now a fine art and became ornate in style and manner. Copiousness ran into verbosity, sound was as important as sense, grace of gesture was an end in itself, and the subject was sacrificed to personal vanity. In short, oratory had passed into the self-conscious stage. There were, of course, examples of what I have called the first and third stage and they have been picked out and commended; and there have been various fluctuations from one stage to another in different periods and different countries; but on the whole there has been a gradual drift toward a more mature stage where feeling is present merely as the servant of the intellect.

Let us consider the development attained in England. In his *Modern Parliamentary Eloquence* Lord Curzon raises this question, "Is the orator greatly assisted by grace of manner, voice, and action, and is he correspondingly handicapped by uncomely and ignoble appearance, harsh accents, and inelegant gestures. He says that in the case of Chatham, Gladstone, O'Connell, and Bright much was gained by the splendor and harmony of their physical endowments. On the other hand, Burke was angular and awkward in his gestures, Pitt sawed the air with his arm like a windmill, Grattan indulged in violent gestures and swayed his body to and fro, Peel put his hands under his coat-tails, and Macaulay was ungainly in action. Lord Curzon comes to this conclusion: first, that all attempts to make a study of action, manner, or even delivery have been abandoned; secondly, that as speaking becomes less dramatic and more businesslike, even unstudied action falls every day into greater disuse. In the British Parliament a speaker stands almost motionless. His hands may cling to the lapel of his coat, or toy with a pince-nez. In all probability his most violent action would be a mild castigation of the brass-bound box in front of him. Gestures of any sort are dying out. Here is Curzon's description of Asquith, "There is no gesticulation, no abandonment, no flash or glow, but the case is stated, argued, and proved with a force that is almost stunning." Curzon believes that there is no reason to deplore the cessation of fine speaking. Its practise in the passage of

time has taken on different and less ambitious forms in consonance with the more practical spirit of the age. He thinks that at the present time it would be quite impossible for Canning to point to war ships in the harbor and say: "You well know, gentlemen, how soon one of these stupendous masses, now reposing on those shadows in perfect stillness, how soon upon call of patriotism or necessity, it would assume the likeness of an animated thing instinct with life and motion; how soon it would ruffle, as it were, its swelling plumage, how quickly it would put forth all its beauty and bravery, collect its scattered elements of strength and awaken its dormant thunder." "Imagine," says Lord Curzon, "the effect of this or of some ancient masterpiece of oratory delivered to the English Parliament!"

What is the status of action and emotional speaking in our own country? Sometime ago you doubtless read an article, I think it was in the *Nation*, which declared that it would be impossible for even Webster himself to hold the interest of the Senate today with an introduction so elaborate as that about the mariner or with a conclusion so rhetorical as his apostrophe to the standard full high advanced. Colonel Higginson tells an incident that illustrates the change as he saw it in 1898. An old politician had been absent from his home town for many years. In the days of his prime he had been noted as a model orator. Upon his return it was but natural that he should be asked to address the college assembly. He responded with a speech after the order of those orations that were once so famous and was greeted by the students with courteous applause. The professor who sat next to Mr. Higginson remarked at the close of the session, "Colonel Higginson, is the change in me or in the speaker?" "Curiously enough," said the Colonel, "I was thinking the same thing myself." They reached the conclusion that the orator had not changed in the thirty years of his absence but that public speaking in that time had been pitched in a much more natural key. Colonel Higginson did not enter into the reason for the change. It may have been the result of a number of forces, but one, I think is worthy of special notice in this connection. This is the scientific method of inquiry and treatment. "In the beginning of the nineteenth century," says President Eliot, "this method was known to but very few, but it has become indispensable in all fields of inquiry including psychology, philanthropy, and religion." This method of investigation has

had an influence also upon public speaking. The desire for pure knowledge has tended to throw into the background the emotional element and to place the intellect as the dominant feature in our public addresses. When we discuss even vital themes nowadays we consider them in a different way and with much less emotional demonstration than was used fifty years ago. When the woman suffrage question was beginning to receive attention, there was much elaboration of the justice of the cause, but recently speakers have abandoned the appeal to sentiment as vague and unsatisfactory and have made plain statements of woman's qualification for the ballot. This change of treatment is bound to bring a more subdued form of action. The same modification is noticeable in the speeches on the prohibition problem. Some years ago orators who spoke on this theme amplified the woes of the drunkard's family and denounced King Alcohol. But speakers are not treating the subject in this way now. Even the orations in the college contests show evidence of intelligent investigation. They present authoritative statements about the effect of alcohol upon the mind and body of the drinker and about the influence of the liquor traffic upon social and economic conditions. By the application of scientific methods in the treatment of their themes, speakers have been able to advance the suffrage and prohibition movements more much rapidly than the speakers who relied upon emotional appeal.

At an interstate contest a short time since two speakers attracted my attention. In one the intellect seemed to control and the emotion rarely if ever gained the ascendancy. In the other the emotion seemed uppermost, although the speaker was not without thought. One of the judges, an attorney somewhat prominent in the state, declared that the man who was so emotional was out of date. When the average judgment was revealed it was found that the man who had controlled his feeling and who had deliberate action and convincing thought was given an advantage over the other speaker.

From Congress down to the college contest has there not been a drift toward a kind of speaking in which the intellect controls and the feeling and action are subdued and secondary? Webster and Everett, the models of their day, have given place to Lincoln. Are men like Sunday and Bryan the ideal speakers of the time? Darrow said to Bryan in the words of a recent poet:

"You're head of the party before you are ready;
A leader should lead with thought."

I am inclined to think that the teachers of Public Speaking would select Hughes or Wilson or some one in whom intelligence is the dominant element.

Again, what has happened in the development of our own profession in the last twenty-five years or less? There was a time when speaking was primarily a fine art. As a course of study it included Rhetoric, Literature, and Philosophy. Its purpose was to please and to present the beautiful. Very naturally emphasis drifted from the substance to the form, and artificiality took the place of art. How long the profession remained in this self-conscious stage, what schools fought it and what institutions fostered it,—these are questions apart from our purpose. At any rate, not very long ago there came an awakening. Teachers began to see that emotional speaking was not meeting the requirements of the practical age in which we live, and they accordingly established departments of Public Speaking. They realized that their profession, though it had to do with what may well be regarded a fine art, had, for the great mass of people, a very practical aspect. They saw that students of the colleges and universities were not going into active life after graduation to move people through appeals to emotion but that they would mould society, if they influenced it at all, through the application of intelligence to their speaking. In other words, they felt the influence of the scientific method of inquiry and treatment and they accordingly shaped their courses in Public Speaking to meet the practical needs of a practical age.

In bringing together the ideas of our discussion, I would say that the individual passes through a gradual development from a stage in which feeling is the dominant element and thought subordinate to a stage in which the intellect with growing power controls even the strongest emotion. As we survey the progress of races and nations toward civilization, we see that their acting and speaking tend from a stage of almost childish abandon to one of mature deliberation. In England and the United States at present the scientific method of inquiry and treatment and the passion for pure knowledge have changed the handling of nearly all themes which public speakers are called upon to discuss, and the result has been a pretty general recognition of a form of speaking characterized by subdued gesture and emotion and by an intellectual conviction that is almost irresistible.

THE VOICE AS A REVELATION OF THE INDIVIDUAL¹

CLARA KATHLEEN ROGERS

Boston, Massachusetts

IT IS encouraging to those of us who are votaries of beautiful speech to note that this subject, so long and painfully neglected, is now attracting serious attention, and that already a number of our schools are feeling it incumbent on them to send out into the world young people who will no longer discredit them by the slipshod speech and the discordant voices by which our ears have so long been offended.

Courses in oral English are being added to the school curriculum; teachers of spoken English are in request, and summer courses have been inaugurated in a number of our universities to enable teachers of all classes to fit themselves for the new demands made on them. These summer courses should be gratefully welcomed by teachers who, during the school term, are too busy with work to devote much time to self-improvement.

It is for us now to consider whether the methods pursued are likely to bring about the desired results, and, if not, why not. My personal observations have led me to conclude that too little attention is paid to the voice itself—to its quality, volume, modulation, carrying power, and continuity of tone. Exercises in articulation, practiced with diligence, are admirable in themselves both for inducing flexibility of the speech organs and for training the ear to demand a clean-cut enunciation of syllables. The results of such exercises are highly satisfactory as far as they go, but they do not go far enough; for perfect articulation is, after all, only one element of perfect speech. The principal element, that which carries and renders effective the articulations, is the vocal sound, which is air from the lungs, vibrated at the glottis, developed in the resonator, and projected through the mouth. It is, moreover, the vocal sound that conveys the emotional element—the variations of mood, and the subtlest shades of feeling—to the hearer. This can only be, however, when the voice is produced according to natural law. It is then the most spontaneous, the most direct expression of our inmost self; whereas, if artificially produced, it is a complete negation of all that is real and true in us.

¹ Read at the New England Public Speaking Conference, Harvard University, April 8, 1916.

It is, therefore, the use of the voice that should engage the attention of instructors before anything else. This, apparently, is not the case. In schools of the higher grades, where oral English is taught, they are in too great a hurry to make a display. Dramatic recitations are undertaken before the fundamental difficulties of speech are overcome—I may say, before they are even approached. The pupils are put to run before they can walk! Of what use can be the attempt to make dramatic inflections, if the voice be not inflective, when, in fact, there is no audible voice to inflect? At many of the performances in schools one is painfully conscious of the effort made for intelligent expression, and equally so of its utter futility. The voices are, for the most part, either inaudible, or else pitched so high that only a series of shrill, inarticulate sounds are heard; and as for the text, that remains a mystery to the hearer. It is, indeed, utter folly to attempt any such ambitious demonstrations until a proper technique of speech is thoroughly mastered.

The technique of speech, baldly speaking, embraces the perfecting of all the different vowel or vocal sounds and of all the different articulations. These two elements, vowels and consonants, so distinct from each other in character, in location, and in period, should be heard in rhythmic sequence, each having its own independent action. On such a foundation all other qualities pertaining to beautiful speech can rest securely; indeed, they follow naturally, without effort.

The question arises, Is the right principle of speech technique generally understood by its instructors? I fear not! The tendency is to teach phonetics from a purely physiological standpoint, and to this practice I attribute the artificial and ineffective voices we are deploring. We are too prone to regard voice as the result of a mechanism only. We keep forgetting that the mechanism of voice is merely an instrument, subject to an intelligence that both conceives and indicates its object.

Voice is properly the result of an impulsive act of will conveyed in terms of sound, and not of location nor of kinetic sensation. Let us say, for example, that you want to hear from yourself a particular tone of voice, qualified to express a given mood or emotion. This object is a conscious conception of your brain expressed through the operation of a subconscious intelligence which directs your involuntary or automatic processes. If instructors would make it clear to their pupils which actions are voluntary, and which are involuntary, it would be far more to the purpose than a detailed description of the various changes in the resonator occasioned by the different positions of the tongue in forming vowels.

What we need to be taught is to perceive the right qualities of tone as sensed by the ear. As the ear is the only legitimate arbiter of sound, all sounds should be submitted to it in the same way that objects of form and color are submitted to the eye. But alas! the ear, today, is a much neglected organ. Visible speech is gradually defeating audible speech.

It is strange that visible speech should be so much favored by teachers of elocution. I hold that such a method of instruction should only be resorted to in cases where the ear of the speaker is defective. It then becomes helpful, as the crutch is to the cripple. I am fully aware of the theory that after the speaker has become familiar with all the different vowel placements these will adjust themselves automatically. My personal experience, however, especially as a teacher of singing, has shown me that the theory does not work. In the first place, deliberate placements of the parts employed in vowel formations are seldom exact; they are mostly exaggerated in effect. In this they differ from the placements of consonants, which we have entirely under our control. In the second place, the attention of the speaker or singer becomes absorbed by the kinetic sensations—by which I mean the different movements that take place in the resonator—and, if I may use a contradiction in terms, it is voluntariness of these movements that becomes automatic. In other words, the habit of consciously adjusting the tongue to the different vowels becomes a fixed habit, and that fixed habit antedates the conception of the sound which should be the ruling power, and first in the field.

We have only to hear the voices of deaf-mutes, for whose benefit the system of visible speech was originated, to realize how discordant the human voice can become when bereft of guidance from the organ provided by nature for that purpose. Is it logical to train the voices of normal subjects in the same way as the voices of defectives? Should we offer crutches to those who are not cripples? Are we not, in so doing, inviting a deterioration of our God-given faculties?

It is a well-known fact that in effects produced partly by voluntary and partly by involuntary processes co-ordinate action of the parts employed is interrupted by concentration on any one of those processes. The vocal organs, as a whole instrumentality, will respond co-ordinately only to one mental formula at a time, expressed in a single act of will, to wit, the vocal sound itself of which the completed effect is first mentally conceived. Visible speech isolates the vowel from the vibratory element of voice, as in whispering, whereas the vowel is properly an integral element of voice. This isolation causes the functioning of the glottis to be

indirect. It responds to the vowel only as a reflex instead of being the fundamental element of voice. An indirect vibratory action of the glottis includes a devitalized action of the breath, and I argue that herein lies the cause of the inaudibility of voice which so distresses us as we strain every nerve to gather what some of our public speakers, lecturers, and actors are talking about—to say nothing of our tribulations in our daily intercourse with people.

Strange as it may seem, it is precisely this inadequateness of the fundamental vibrations of voice which lies at the root of the shrill, twangy, discordant voices that assail our ears so painfully. The speaker's vocal impotence induces him to make contractions and squeezings of parts above the glottis, thinking through conscious effort to obtain that force and impetus which is lacking fundamentally. Most of the strident, aggressive, twangy voices we hear proceed from those who use vital and nervous energy misdirected, because they have never been furnished with the proper means of venting their energy beautifully. They must needs fall back, therefore, on the only way they know of making themselves heard. One evil consequence of this is that, hypnotized by the sound of their own vulgar voices, these young people suit everything else to it; the result is distortion of words, slang expressions, and rough manners.

It is really astounding how utterly unaware many of the highly intelligent teachers in our schools are of their own shortcomings in this matter of speech, how indifferently they are to the sound of their own voices. Is this due to a dulness of the auditory nerve or to a lack of artistic sense? By this latter I mean that sense which causes us to demand peremptorily from ourselves a perfect expression of ourselves. The question remains unanswered.

Now, to proceed to the more practical side of the question, it seems to me that some innovations should be made in the order of instruction in the primary grades of our schools, if reform in the speech of the rising generation is to be accomplished; for, by the time young people reach the higher grades, slovenly habits of speech are already formed, owing to neglect in the primary grades; and it takes some time and some pains to form new habits, as all teachers know to their cost.

1. Much more time and attention should be given to instruction in spoken English and in reading aloud. A daily drill of at least half an hour is necessary during the first year of primary education.
2. This instruction might well be substituted for some other study, which could be undertaken later with far better results.
3. Such a daily drill in speech gymnastics, based on proper lung inflation, would be of untold benefit during the plastic period of life, when good habits are easily formed.

4. Considered merely from the standpoint of health, correct voice production is a wonderful panacea. It embraces aeration of the blood, increase of red corpuscles, ventilation of the lungs and throat, and it is the one sure way of nipping in the bud a tendency to tuberculosis.

Surely these reasons alone should suffice to rouse the powers that be to concerted action to afford the rising generation a fair start in life physically as well as mentally.

Speech is fundamental, and belongs naturally to primary education. It is not right that criticism should fall on our universities, the temples of the higher education, because of the inefficiency of their graduates in this rudimentary study. And yet, I regret to say, such criticisms are but too frequently heard.

It is a truism that all improvement depends on forming new habits. The ear, as well as the speech organs, should be accustomed to good sounds; and for this reason it is just as important that all the teachers in every department should use their voices well, enunciate clearly, and pronounce correctly, as it is for the teachers specializing in oral English to do so. Otherwise, the results of the work in the classes in oral English will be defeated by the frequency of bad example elsewhere.

This important requirement can be fulfilled only by establishing a fixed standard of efficiency in spoken English, to be attained by teachers before they can be appointed in any department. Were a proper use of the voice and good enunciation insisted on, those proposing to enter the ranks as teachers would be under the necessity of taking advantage of the summer courses now offered in various parts of the country and of devoting some time to the breaking up of their own careless habits of speech. Nothing short of daily practice and constant hammering at the same thing will make any lasting impression on either young or old. The reasons why the voice in speech should be regarded as the keystone of education are manifold. Success or failure in life largely depend on it. Are we not instinctively attracted or repelled by the mere sound of a voice? Do we not form a rough estimate not only of the status, but of the character, temperament, and disposition of an individual from the way he speaks? Does not a thin, monotonous voice suggest to us a negative personality, and does not a man's voice pitched affectedly high suggest effeminacy, lack of force and virility? Do we not detect in rough, harsh, shrill, and twangy voices a vulgarity and a coarseness underlying the actual status of the individual? On the other hand, are we not equally quick to recognize a frank, whole-souled nature in one whose voice is natural and spontaneous, whose speech is direct and unaffected? We are ready to place con-

fidence in such a one, we admit him to our friendship without question.

Paul Heyse says, "The voice is the man." This is fundamentally true, for when the voice is used according to natural law it reveals hidden depths in our nature of which even we ourselves were unconscious. But alas! we have for generations so tampered with nature and so misused our organs of speech that our voices but too often utterly belie our true characteristics. The excuse is often made that Americans have weak throats and that this is the cause of their defective voices. Such, however, is not the case. That there are weak throats I do not deny, but the weak throats are the *result* of misuse of the voice and not the cause.

You all know that constant disuse of any part of the body results in atrophy of that part; and it is precisely atrophy resulting from disuse of the right vocal muscles that causes flabby and unhealthy throats. Dr. Lennox Browne, the well-known English throat specialist, goes a great deal farther in citing the evils due to inadequate breathing and its natural consequence, bad voice production. For instance, he says that it causes congestion of the vascular supply to the mucous membrane, irritation of the sensory nerves, resulting in constant deterioration of power and control, nervous depression, and injury to the general health. Such a catalogue of evils should surely, where other arguments fail, frighten us into giving serious attention to voice production.

There is, however, a still deeper reason for reform than even the effect on our health of the misuse of the voice; and that deeper reason is the reaction of a perverted tone of voice on us. In constantly hearing our own monotonous voices, devoid of all expression, we gradually lose all impulse for such force or variety of expression as we may temperamentally possess. As time goes on, our utter lack of expressiveness ends in our having nothing to express. The mind grows monotonous; mental energy follows the lead of physical deterioration by the inexorable law of reaction. Thus we may account for the large number of listless, half-hearted, unmagnetic, and unimpressive people we meet within a country where energy, vigor, and enthusiasm are the prevailing characteristics of the people.

You may think perhaps that I am stretching the point in making neglect of proper voice training responsible for so much. But when we consider that the raw material of voice is actually the air we breathe, it certainly can be no exaggeration to attribute the frequency of anemia and of general defective functioning to lack of proper early training in voice production.

Listless and anemic people have probably never known what it is to draw a full deep breath; they habitually breathe only just enough to keep above ground. They do not stand erect, with expanded chest, as we all should do, and when they sit they sag all over. They say they feel too tired to hold themselves up. They would not feel tired if they did! It is the kind of voiceless speech which results from such devitalized subjects. One hears it at committee meetings, and even in the lecture-room. When this type of rarified speech is not affected (as it often is), it is obvious that the intake of oxygen is insufficient, the circulation of the blood consequently sluggish, and vitality at a low ebb. One cannot help reflecting that a depleted vitality is all that such persons have to hand down to their children, wherewith to face the battle of life. And that seems a pity! Let those in authority look to it. Lack of proper early training is to blame. Our schools are responsible.

In conclusion I would say one thing more. As the power of suggestion is at the present day so generally admitted, it seems scarcely possible for us to ignore the pernicious influence of the vulgar and discordant tones that we have always with us in the voices of our people. We are constantly preaching the evil effects of impure suggestion; shall we begrudge the time and pains that are needed to put a stop to this all-pervading offense to harmony? Shall this precious instrument, voice, so deftly fashioned to reveal the divine spark latent in the human creature, carry our message jangled and out of tune? Should we be content to have our voices reflect our individuality as a cracked mirror reflects our features? Surely not! Then let us as teachers, parents, patriots, or simple votaries of the eternal fitness of things, co-operate in a determined effort to establish and spread wide a radical reform in this most conspicuous and most vital expression of national individuality—the voices of our people.

HIGH-SCHOOL PLAYS IN IOWA

GLENN N. MERRY
University of Iowa

IT IS hoped this list of plays presents some interesting information. Similar studies can be made in other states and the results compared. Frankly, I cannot admire the taste of some of the communities in staging certain of these plays. Nevertheless, the fact remains that the plays "made good," and we find poor plays "making good" in most of our states. Our duty as teachers is clear. We should engage in active propaganda that will make the public demand better plays even in the high school. At a later time the writer may be able to show how the schools of Iowa are developing a taste for better things in the drama, especially since this investigation has been made.

The data herein presented have been arranged from a questionnaire mailed to all the high schools in Iowa by the Public-Speaking Service of the University of Iowa Extension Division.

Nearly all of the high schools were kind enough to reply with a list. But the replies were in most instances either inadequate or incorrect, so that all the replies were verified. All publishers furnishing plays herein noted have been written to and a correct statement regarding the play secured. Schools reported quite inadequately on royalties; and, since these vary somewhat, no further listing of royalties has been made except where the school reported directly. The grade of satisfaction which each play gave the community, of course, is probably the estimate of one individual, such as the superintendent, principal, or English teacher. But it can be taken as typical, for the person reporting the grade is in most instances the individual most interested in the success of the production. Where more than one grade appears, each grade represents the estimate from a different city.

PLAYS PRODUCED RECENTLY BY THE HIGH SCHOOLS OF IOWA

Notations of the plays are made in the following order: title of play, author, publisher, classification, royalty (when reported), number of acts, number of stage settings, number of male and female characters, and grade of satisfaction the play gave the community.

Aaron Boggs, Freshman. W. B. Hare. Dennison. Comedy. 3a. 2ss.
8m., 8f. 90, 95.
Alma Mater. —. Chicago Manuscript Co. Comedy. \$10. 7m., 5f. 95.
All a Mistake. W. C. Parker. Holcomb or Dennison. Comedy. 3a. 2ss.
4m., 4f. 90, 96, 100.

- All-of-a-Sudden Peggy.* Earnest Denny. French. Comedy. 3a. 2ss. 6m., 5f. 100.
- Altar of Riches, The.* Charles Ulrich. Dennison. 2ss. 5m., 5f. 95.
- American Bride, An.* Leslie T. Peacock. French. Comedy. \$10. 3a. 3ss. 7m., 4f. 70.
- American Citizen, An.* Madelaine L. Ryley. French. Comedy. 4a. 3ss. 9m., 5f. 90.
- Anne of Old Salem.* Batchelder. Dramatic Publishing Co. Drama. 3a. 2ss. 5m., 8f. 75, 80.
- As You Like It.* Shakespeare. Dramatic Publishing Company. Comedy. 5a. 16m., 4f. 100.
- At the End of the Rainbow.* Lindsey Barbee. Eldridge, Dennison, or Dramatic Publishing Co. Comedy. 3a. 3ss. 6m., 14f. 80, 85, 85, 89, 90, 90, 95, 95, 98.
- At Yale.* Owen Davis. Flanagan, or Sanger & Jordan. Comedy. 3a. 5ss. 16m., 4f. 95.
- Bachelor Hall.* Rachel E. Baker. Baker. Farce. 3a. 1ss. 8m., 4f.
- Barbara Fritchie.* Clyde Fitch. Sanger & Jordan. Drama. 4a. 5ss. 13m., 6f., soldiers, etc. 100.
- Because I Love You.* John A. Frazer. Eldridge. Drama. 4a. 8m., 4f.
- Bell in the Forest, The.* Anthony J. Schindler. J. Fischer & Brothers. Romantic Operetta. 2a. 12 characters and chorus. 100.
- Bess Goes to Europe.* Rea Goodman. Eldridge. Comedy. 3a. 4ss. 5m., 6f. 100.
- Blundering Billy.* Anthony E. Wills. Eldridge. Farical Comedy. 3a. 1ss. 5m., 3f. 100.
- Box of Monkeys, A.* Grace L. Furniss. Eldridge, or Baker. Farce. 2a. 1ss. 2m., 3f. 95.
- Breezy Point.* B. M. Locke. Dramatic Publishing Co., or Baker. Comedy. 3a. 2ss. 13f. 80.
- Broken Home, A, or Three Glasses A Day.* Henri Wilkins. Howe. Drama. 2a. 3m., 3f.
- Brown of Harvard.* R. J. Johnson. French, or Sanger & Jordan. Comedy. 4a. 3ss. 22m., 4f. 90.
- Bulbul.* Rhys-Herbert. Fischer, or Eldridge. Japanese Operetta. 2a. 5m., 3f., and chorus. 100.
- Burglar, The.* Cameron. French. Farce. 1a. 1ss. 5f. 85, 95.
- Captain Dick.* Arthur Buzzell. Dick. Comedy. 4a. 3ss. 8m., 4f. 98.
- Captain of Plymouth.* S. S. Tibbals. Eldridge. Operetta. 3a. 10m., 9f., soldiers, sailors, Indians, etc.
- Captain Rackett.* Charles Townsend. French, or Dramatic Publishing Co. Comedy. 3a. 1ss. 5m., 4f. 90.
- Case of Suspension, A.* Louise L. Wilson. J. R. Hellener. Howe, or Penn. Comedy. 1a. 1ss. 5m., 5f. 95, 98.
- Charley's Aunt.* Brandon Thomas. Chicago Manuscript Co. Comedy. \$25. 3a. 3ss. 6m., 4f. 90, 100.
- Charity Girl.* —. Chicago Manuscript Co. Comedy. 3a. 3ss. 8m., 8f., and chorus.
- Christmas Carol.* Adapted by Clarence Satterlee from Dickens. Dramatic Publishing Co. Comedy. 3a. 3ss. 15m., 7f. 95.
- Christmas Chime, The.* Margaret Cameron. French. Comedy. 1a. 1ss. 2m., 2f. 95.

- College Chap, The.* H. L. Newton. Baker. Comedy. 3a. 2ss. 11m., 7f. 75.
- College Chums.* Anthony E. Willis. Dramatic Publishing Co. Comedy. 3a. 1ss. 9m., 3f.
- College Town, The.* W. B. Hare. French, or Dennison. Comedy. 3a. 3ss. 9m., 8f. 95, 95.
- College Widow, The.* George Ade. Sanger & Jordan. Comedy. 4a. 4ss. 15m., 10f. 95.
- Colonel's Maid, The.* C. L. Dalrymple. Eldridge, or Baker. Comedy. 3a. 2ss. 6m., 3f. 100.
- Comus.* John Milton. Eldridge. 4m., 2f., attendants. 87, 95.
- Country Kid, A.* Nesbit Scoville. French. Comedy. 3a. 5ss. 6m., 3f. 80.
- County Chairman, The.* George Ade. Sanger & Jordan. Comedy. 4a. 4ss. 16m., 6f., and children, etc.
- Cranberry Corners.* A. L. Tubbs. Baker. Comedy. 4a. 2ss. 6m., 6f. 90.
- Cricket on the Hearth, The.* Albert Smith. Penn, or Baker. Comedy. 4a. 2ss. 5m., 5f. 85.
- Cupid at Vassar.* Owen Davis. French, or Dramatic Publishing Co. Comedy. \$25. 4a. 3ss. 4m., 4 to 12f. 82, 90, 90, 95, 95, 100.
- Christopher Junior.* Madeleine Riley. French. Comedy. 4a. 3ss. 8m., 4f. 98.
- Daughter of the Desert, A.* Charles Ulrich. Dennison, or Eldridge. Comedy. Drama. 4a. 2ss. 6m., 4f.
- Deacon, The.* Horace C. Dale. Dick & Fitzgerald, or Eldridge. Comedy. 4ss. 5a. 8m., 6f. or more. 90.
- Deacon's Second Wife, The.* Allan Abbott. Eldridge, or Baker. Comedy. 3a. 2ss. 6m., 6f. 85, 80.
- Depot Lunch Counter, The.* Frank Dumont. Penn. Farce. 1a. 1ss. 13m., 2f.
- Diamonds and Hearts.* Effie W. Merriman. Dramatic Publishing Co., or Eldridge. Comedy. 3a. 2ss. 4m., 5f. 90, 90.
- District Attorney, The.* O. E. Wilkins. Baker & Co. Comedy. 4a. 3ss. 12m., 4f., policemen, court officers, etc. 100.
- Dodging an Heiress, or His Uncle's Choice.* Bell Palmer. Eldridge. Comedy-drama. 2a. 2ss. 7m., 7f. 95.
- Dot, the Miner's Daughter.* Lizzie M. Elvyn. Holcomb. Drama. 3a. 9m., 5f.
- Down in Dixie.* Chas. Townsend. Dennison. 4a. 3ss. 8m., 4f. 90.
- Dr. Wake's Patients.* W. G. Maskay. French. Comedy. 4a. 4ss. 10m., 7f.
- Dream That Came True, The.* Lindsey Barbee. Eldridge. Comedy. 3a. 3ss. 6m., 13f.
- Elopement of Ellen.* M. J. Warren. Baker. Comedy. 3a. 2ss. 4m., 3f., 90.
- Engaged by Wednesday.* G. A. Owens. Baker. Comedy. 3a. 1ss. 5m., 11f. 95.
- Esmeralda.* F. H. Burnett. Flanagan, or French. Tragedy. \$10. 5a. 3ss. 6m., 5f. 90, 95, 95, 95, 97.
- Everystudent.* Everett. Eldridge. Morality. 1a. 1ss. 22 characters. 85.
- Everyyouth.* Harry L. Newton. Dennison. Morality. 3a. 1ss. 7m., 6f. 95.
- Fanchon the Cricket.* George Sand. Dramatic Publishing Co. Drama. 5a. 4ss. 9m., 7f. 85.

- Fanny and the Servant Problem.* Jerome K. Jerome. French. Comedy. 4a. 1ss. 5m., 17f. 95.
- Feast of the Red Corn, The.* Paul Bliss. Willis Music Co. Operetta. 3 characters and chorus. 90.
- Fifteenth of January, The.* Lindsey Barbee. Dennison. Comedy. 3a. 2ss. 11m., 10f. 85.
- For Old Eli.* Lloyd Thompson. French. Comedy. 4a. 4ss. 15m., 6f. 90.
- Fortune-Hunter, The.* W. Smith. French. Comedy. \$25. 4a. 4ss. 17m., 3f. 90, 100.
- Frances the Suffragette.* Agnes Hyde. Penn. Comedy. 3a. 3ss. 7m., 10f. 85.
- Fortunes of War, The.* Louise L. Wilson. Penn. Farce. 1a. 1ss. 1m., 5f. 95, 100.
- Freshman, The.* Edwin Morris. Eldridge, or Penn. Comedy. 3a. 3ss. 7m., 4f. 92.
- Galligher.* Rea Goodman. Eldridge. Comedy. 3a. 4ss. 4m., 8f. 90.
- Girls of Pallas, The.* Comedy. 2 or 3a. 19f., and chorus and auxiliaries. 85.
- Gold Mine, The.* Brander Matthews. French. 3a. 1ss. 6m., 3f.
- Gypsy Queen, The.* Horace Dale. Dick & Fitzgerald, or Eldridge. Drama. 4a. 5m., 3f., and supers.
- Halfback Sandy.* Norman Swartout. Baker & Co. Comedy. 3a. 3ss. 17m., 2f. 95.
- Hans von Smash.* T. S. Denison. Dennison. Farce. 1a. 1ss. 4m., 3f. 97.
- Hazel Kirk.* Steele Mackaye. French. Drama. 4a. 3ss. 9m., 5f.
- Heavenly Twins, The.* Lillian Schreiner. Eldridge. Comedy. 3a. 3ss. 4m., 9f. 75, 90.
- Her Friend the Enemy.* Harry Van Denmark. Penn. Tragedy. 4a. 2ss. 6m., 4f. with a few supers. 100.
- Her Ladyship's Niece.* Evelyn Simms. Dick & Fitzgerald, or Holcomb. Comedy. 4a. 2ss. 4m., 4f.
- Hicks At College.* Ralph E. Dyar. Dramatic Publishing Co. Comedy. 3a. 3ss. 12m., 9f. 90.
- Higbee of Harvard.* C. Townsend. Baker, or Eldridge. Comedy. 3a. 3ss. 5m., 4f. 90, 90, 95.
- His Uncle's Choice, or P... an Heiress.* Bell Palmer. Eldridge. Comedy-drama. 2a. 2ss. 7f. 95.
- His Uncle John.* Rea Goodman. Eldridge. Comedy. 3a. 2ss. 4m., 3f. 90.
- Home.* T. W. Robertson. Dennison, or French. Comedy. 3a. 1ss. 4m., 3f. 85.
- Hoodoo, The.* W. B. Hare. Baker, or Eldridge. Comedy. 3a. 2ss. 6m., 16f. or more. 88, 90, 95, 95.
- House Next Door, The.* J. L. Manners. Dramatic Publishing Co., or Werner. Comedy. \$10. 3a. 2ss. 8m., 4f. 90, 98.
- Hunkers Corner.* Adelaide H. Wyeth. Eldridge. Comedy. 3a. 1ss. 12m., 14f. 85.
- Ingomar.* Maria Lovell. Dramatic Publishing Co., or Baker. Drama. 13m., 3f. 95.
- Jedediah Judkins.* Warren J. Brier. Dennison. Comedy. 4a. 4ss. 7m., 5f. 90.
- Joan of Arc.* Fitzball. French. Tragedy. 3a. 8m., 2f. 80.

240 THE QUARTERLY JOURNAL OF PUBLIC SPEAKING

- Just for Fun.* E. M. Crane. Dick & Fitzgerald. Comedy. 3a. 1ss. 2m., 4f. 95.
- Kathleen Mavourneen, or St. Patrick's Eve.* An Irish Drama. Dick & Fitzgerald. 4a. 5ss. 12m., 4f.
- Kentucky Belle, A.* T. Bell Chambers. Penn. Comedy. 3a. 1ss. 8m., 7f. 85.
- Kingdom of Heart's Content, The.* Lindsey Barbee. Eldridge, or Dennison. Comedy. 3a. 2ss. 6m., 12f. 89, 90, 98.
- Lady of Lyons.* Lord Lytton. Dramatic Publishing Co., or Baker. Semi-drama. 5a. 7ss. 12m., 5f. 88.
- Lost, A Chaperon.* W. S. Mauleby. Eldridge. Comedy. 3a. 2ss. 6m., 9f.
- Maidens All Forlorn.* Evelyn Simms. Howe. Comedy. 3a. 1ss. 6m.
- Man From Brandon, The.* J. M. Taylor. Baker. Farce. 1a. 1ss. 3m., 4f. 85.
- Man From Home, The.* Booth Tarkington. A. C. McClurg, or Sanger & Jordan. Comedy. \$50. 4a. 1ss. 10m., 3f. 95, 100.
- Manoeuvres of Jane.* H. A. Jones. French. Comedy. \$25. 4a. 4ss. 10m., 11f. 100.
- Mary Stuart.* Schiller. Baker. Tragedy. 5a. 13m., 4f., and supers. 100.
- Masonic Ring, The.* L. R. Bascombe. Eldridge. Comedy. 3a. 2ss. 3m., 6f. 85.
- Melting Pot, The.* Israel Zangwill. Dramatic Publishing Co., or MacMillan. Drama. 4a. 4ss. 5m., 4f.
- Men, Maids, and Matchmakers.* Eleanor Crane. Dick & Fitzgerald. Comedy. 3a. 1ss. 4m., 4f. 100.
- Mennenmen Inn.* Elsie West. Baker, or French. Comedy. 3a. 1ss. 17f. 85.
- Merchant of Venice Up-to-Date.* Eldridge. Comedy. 5a. 4ss. 9m. and football team. 7f. 85, 90, 90, 100.
- Merry Widow, The.* Leicester Buckingham. French. Comedy. 2a. 2ss. 5m., 5f.
- Mice and Men.* M. L. Ryley. French. Comedy. \$10. 4a. 4ss. 7m., 5f. 85.
- Midsummer-Night's Dream.* Shakespeare. French. Comedy. 5a. 14m., 6f. 90, 90, 95, 95, 100.
- Mr. Bob.* Rachel E. Baker. Eldridge. Comedy. 2a. 1ss. 3m., 4f. 90, 85, 90, 95, 100.
- Mr. Easyman's Niece.* Bell M. Locke. Eldridge, or Baker. Comedy. 4a. 3ss. 6m., 4f. 95.
- Mrs. Briggs of the Poultry-Yard.* E. J. Whiting. Eldridge, or Baker. Comedy. 3a. 1ss. 6m., 6f. 80.
- Mrs. Compton's Manager.* L. O. Osgood. Baker. Comedy. 3a. 2ss. 7m., 6f. 90.
- My Cousin Timmy.* F. H. Guild. Baker. Comedy. 2a. 1ss. 2m., 8f. 95.
- My Uncle From India.* Harold Sander. Flanagan, or Dick & Fitzgerald. Comedy. 4a. 3ss. 13m., 4f. 95.
- Naked Truth, The.* George Paston. French. Comedy. 3a. 3ss. 8m., 6f.
- Nautical Knot.* Maude Inch. Eldridge. Musical Comedy. 2a. 2ss. 6m., 5f., and chorus. 100.
- Nephew or Uncle.* A. Abbott. Baker. Comedy. 3a. 1ss. 8m., 3f. 93, 95.
- New Lady Bantock, The.* Jerome K. Jerome. French. Comedy. \$10. 4a. 1ss. 5m., 17f. 92.

- Not A Man in the House.* S. Jennie Smith. Dennison. Comedy. 2a. 1ss.
5f. 90.
- Niobe.* Harry & Edward Paulton. French. Comedy. \$15. 3a. 1ss.
5m., 7f. 90.
- Obstinate Family, The.* —. French. Farce. 1a. 1ss. 3m., 3f. 90.
- Old Oaken Bucket, The.* Mary M. Parker. Dennison. Melodrama. 4a.
2ss. 8m., 6f. 70.
- Our Wives.* Frank Mandel. Baker. Comedy. 3a. 2ss. 5m., 4f. 98.
- Out of the Shadows into the Light.* Mercedes. St. Xavier's Academy. Com-
edy. 4a. 3ss. 2m., 10f. 95.
- Pennant, The.* Coville and Lehrer. Theodore Presser, or Eldridge.
Operetta. 2a. 8m., 5f. 95.
- Pillars of Society.* Ibsen. Dramatic Publishing Co., or Baker. 4a. 1ss.
10m., 9f.
- Piper, The.* J. P. Peabody, Houghton, Mifflin. 4a. 13m., 6f., 5 children. 90.
- Piper's Pay, The.* Cameron. French. Comedy. 1a. 1ss. 7f. 90.
- Popping by Proxy.* O. E. Young. Baker. Farce. 1a. 1ss. 2m., 4f. 95.
- Princess, The.* L. May Houghout. Baker, or Eldridge. Comedy. 5a. 5m.
and any number f. (about five speaking parts). 70.
- Private Secretary, The.* Charles Hawtrey. French. Comedy. 3a. 2ss.
9m., 4f. 95, 95.
- Private Tutor, The.* E. J. Whisler. Baker. Farce. 3a. 2ss. 5m.,
3f. 100.
- Pygmalion and Galatea.* W. S. Gilbert. Penn. Comedy. 3a. 1ss. 5m.,
4f. 91.
- Rebellion of Mrs. Barclay.* M. E. Countryman. Baker. Comedy. 2a.
3m., 6f. 85, 95.
- Revolt, The.* Ellis P. Butler. Eldridge, or French. Comedy. 1a. 1ss.
8f. or more. 90.
- Rivals, The.* Richard B. Sheridan. Baker. 5a. 2ss. 7m., 4f. 90.
- Rooms to Let.* M. N. Beebe. French. Farce. 1a. 1ss. 3m., 4f. 98.
- Rose O'Plymouth Town.* Beulah M. Dix and Evelyn G. Sutherland.
Dramatic Publishing Co. Romantic Comedy. \$10. 4a. 2ss. 4m.,
4f. 85.
- Russian Honeymoon.* Mrs. Burton Harrison. Dramatic Publishing Co.
Comedy. 3a. 2ss. 4m., 3f. 98.
- Savageland.* W. B. Hare. Dennison. Musical Comedy. \$10. 2a. 2ss.
5m., 5f., and chorus. 95.
- School Ma'am, The.* T. S. Denison. Eldridge, or Dennison. Comedy. 4a.
2ss. 6m., 5f. 80.
- Scrap of Paper, A.* J. Palgrave Simpson. Baker, or Dramatic Publishing
Co. Comedy. 3a. 3ss. 6m., 6f. 87, 90.
- Senior, The.* E. B. Morris. Penn, or Holcomb. Comedy. 3a. 3ss. 9m.,
6f. 80, 90.
- She Swoops To Conquer.* Goldsmith. Dramatic Publishing Co. 5a. 7m.,
3f. 80, 95.
- Silas Marner.* R. H. McLaughlin. Sanger & Jordan. Tragedy. 3a. 3ss.
4m., 4 or 5f. 95.
- Silent Detective, The.* Merriman. Dramatic Publishing Co. Drama. 3a.
3ss. 6m., 7f. 100.
- Sisterhood of Bridget, The.* Robert E. Ford. Baker. Farce. 3a. 3ss.
7m., 6f. 90.
- Sophomore, The.* E. B. Morris. Eldridge, or Penn. Comedy. 3a. 3ss.
9m., 4f. 80.

242 THE QUARTERLY JOURNAL OF PUBLIC SPEAKING

- Southern Cinderella*, A. W. B. Hare. Eldridge. 3a. 1ss. 7f. 90.
Strenuous Life, A. Richard W. Tully. Baker, or Dramatic Publishing Co. Comedy. \$10. 3a. 1ss. 9m., 4f. 90, 100.
Strongheart. De Mille. French. Comedy. \$50. 4a. 3ss. 17m., 5f. 80, 100.
Sweet Girl Graduates, The. Rea Goodman. Eldridge, or Baker. Comedy. 3a. 3ss. 4m., 7f. 90, 95.
Teeth of the Gift Horse, The. Cameron. French. Comedy. 1a. 1ss. 2m. 4f. 85.
Thread of Destiny, The. Lindsey Barbee. Dennison. Comedy-drama. 3a. 3ss. 9m., 16f. 95, 100.
Three Chauffeurs, The. Willowdine Chatterson. French. Comedy. 2a. 1ss. 17f. 90.
Three Glasses A Day, or The Broken Home. W. Henri Wilkins. Howe, or Holcombe. Drama. 2a. 3m., 3f.
Time of His Life, The. Leona Dalrymple. Baker. Comedy. 3a. 2ss. 6m., 3f. 90.
Toastmaster, The. N. L. Swartout. Flanagan. Comedy. 3a. 3ss. 8m., 2f. 80.
Tony the Convict. Charles Townsend. Dennison, or Flanagan. Drama. 5a. 4ss. 4m., 7f. 95, 95.
Touchdown, The. Marion Short. French. Comedy. 4a. 1ss. 8m., 6f.
Trelawney of the Wells. A. W. Pinero. Dramatic Publishing Co. Comedy. 4a. 3ss. 13m., 9f. 90.
Untangling Tony. Helen Bagg. Penn, or Hellener. Comedy. 2a. 1ss. 3m., 6f. 97.
Valley Farm. A. L. Tubbs. Dennison. Drama. 4a. 3ss. 6m., 6f. 85.
Varsity Coach, The. Eunice T. Gray. French. Comedy. \$5. 3a. 2ss. 6m., 6f. 90, 95.
Vicar of Wakefield, The. Marguerite Merrington. Duffield & Co. Comedy. 5a. 3ss. 13m., 7f. 90.
Virginia Heroine, A. Susie G. McGlone. Baker. Comedy. 3a. 2ss. 11f. 95.
Weaker Sex, The. A. W. Pinero. Baker, or French. Comedy. \$10. 3a. 2ss. 9m., 10f. 85.
What Happened to Jones. George Broadhurst. Eldridge, or French. Comedy. \$25. 3a. 1ss. 7m., 6f. 80, 95, 95, 100, 100.
Which One Won. May E. Countryman. Howe. Comedy. 3a. 3ss. 7m., 5f. 95.
Why Smith Left Home. G. H. Broadhurst. French. Comedy. 3a. 2ss. 5m., 7f. 85.

PUBLISHERS OF PLAYS LISTED

Walter H. Baker & Co., 5 Hamilton Place, Boston, Mass.
 Chicago Manuscript Co., 431 North Clark Street, Chicago, Ill.
 Darcey & Wolford, 1402 Broadway, New York City.
 T. S. Denison & Co., 154 West Randolph Street, Chicago, Ill.
 Dick & Fitzgerald, 18 Ann Street, New York City.
 Dramatic Publishing Co., 542 South Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
 Duffield & Co., 211 West Thirty-Third Street, New York City.
 Eldridge Entertainment House, Franklin, Ohio.
 J. Fischer & Bro., 7 Bible House, New York City.
 A. Flanagan Co., in care of Dramatic Publishing Co., Chicago, Ill.

Samuel French Publishing Co., 28-30 Thirty-eighth Street, New York City.
J. R. Hellener & Co., 922 South Fifth Street, Atchison, Kan.
J. R. Holcombe, 729 St. Clair Avenue, N.E., Cleveland, Ohio.
Howe Publishing Co., Summit County, Ira, Ohio.
National Drama Co., Memphis, Tenn.
Penn Publishing Co., 925 Filbert Street, Philadelphia, Pa.
Preparatory School Play Bureau, 189 West End Avenue, New York City.
Sanger & Jordan, 1428 Broadway, New York City.
St. Xavier's Academy, Beatly, Pa.
Edgar S. Werner & Co., 43 East Nineteenth Street, New York City.
Willis Music Co., 137 West Fourth Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.

THE RELATION OF THE AUDIENCE TO THE DRAMA

DONALD CLIVE STUART

Princeton University

IT HAS been declared that there are no rules of dramatic technique, but that there are merely certain dramatic conventions which are as changeable as April weather. When one considers the multitudinous forms of drama which have existed and the many forms which exist today, he is quite ready to admit that there is no inviolable rule of the drama. Yet there is a *sine qua non* which is a very important factor in dramatic art, and which differentiates it from all other forms of art. It is the audience. All other arts appeal primarily to the individual. Drama, alone, must appeal to the crowd. A dramatist is successful in proportion to his understanding of the audience and his sympathy with its ideals. If a playwright feels, as Jonson did, that the multitude "loves nothing that is right and proper," or, to paraphrase Shakespeare, that the censure of one judicious critic must o'erweigh a whole theatre of others, he must either overcome this attitude or turn to some other form of art for the expression of his ideas. However Shakespeare may have felt at times about writing for an audience, the fact remains that he did appeal even to the groundlings; and it is difficult to imagine him fretting because he had to entertain a crowd made up of people drawn from all walks of life. He was evidently content to accept theatrical conditions as he found them, and to leave to more or less sterile scholars and critics of his time the question of uplifting the drama and the audience.

The influence of the spectators on the drama has been taken into consideration from time immemorial. Plato recorded the fact that the audience brought poets down to its own level. Aristotle said in his *Poetics* that even the actor must descend to the ignorant part of his audience. Lope de Vega claimed that Spanish dramatists did not subject themselves to classical rules, not because they were ignorant, but because the spectators had no taste for such conventions. Molière said that the only rule of the drama was to please the public. Voltaire insisted that all kinds of plays were good except the boresome kind. Mercier, a French critic of the eighteenth

century, put his finger on the cause of the decadence of the contemporary drama when he ascribed it to the fact that French playwrights refused to follow the popular taste. So we might continue indefinitely to cite examples of successful dramatists who kept close watch on the trend of public opinion.

From the very inception of his work, the dramatist must keep in mind the audience. Producers of other forms of art can work with a feeling of courage and freedom born of the knowledge that they will give their work in its final form, that in a manuscript or on the printed page it is accessible for centuries, that the reader can wait for the correct mood in which to judge it, that if this individual or generation does not like it, perhaps in later years it will win appreciation. But the playwright knows that his work will be given one chance, that it must make an instantaneous appeal, not to an individual but to a collection of individuals acting for the most part under the psychology and law of the mob. The dramatist, an individual, must write for a crowd. His success or failure will be quick and complete, and will be decided by a jury without a presiding judge. As a rule a play is thus given one chance for life and only one. If it fails it is generally denied even a phantom existence in book form. The work of poets, philosophers and artists lives after them. With few exceptions the work of a dramatist is interred with his bones. After a dramatist is dead, interest in his dramas falls off in every case, and generally the play dies before its author. In other fields of art many examples can be cited of men whose work has been recognized only after death and who have grown steadily in the world's esteem; but fame of posthumous birth is not bestowed upon the playwright, for the dramatist can never be successful if he is too far behind or at all ahead of his time. He can never make a direct appeal to posterity because he is always too tightly bound by the prejudices and ideals of his contemporary audience,—whatever it may be, good or bad, puritan or frivolous, intellectual or stupid. If Shakespeare still enjoys a rather precarious existence on the stage it is because for generations he has been studied in schools as a poet, philosopher, and psychologist, if not as a playwright. Every English speaking person feels in duty bound to admire Shakespeare and for this reason, with the aid of the finest acting, it is still possible to produce his plays.

An audience composed of a certain number of individuals is absolutely necessary for drama, not merely for financial considera-

tions, but from an artistic viewpoint. One enjoys a picture or a piece of sculpture when viewing it alone. All forms of literature can be appreciated in solitude by the individual fully conscious of his own ego. Perhaps a keener enjoyment comes to one listening to music when quite alone; but one cannot conceive a normal human being preferring to witness a play unsurrounded by his fellow-men. Even if some hermit souls could be found who might prefer such aloof enjoyment, the man has yet to be discovered who can pass unfailing judgment upon the merits of a play given without an audience. The more experienced a manager is, the less he prophesies about a play before he has seen it under fire from the public. A musical critic does not need to see the effect of a symphony upon an audience before passing judgment on it; but no conscientious dramatic critic would try the experiment of writing a criticism of a play produced at a dress rehearsal no matter how smooth the performance might be. This is not because the critic is insincere and changes his opinions in defence to the opinion of the audience; but it is because he has in a measure sunk his individuality, has given up a part of his ego, and is no longer a unit in himself, but is a part of a large whole: the mob. So it is that certain lines and whole scenes change from tragic to comic effect and *vice versa* when played before an audience, though no change has been made in the manner of presentation. Thus it happens quite frequently that a line meant to be taken seriously in a vital scene will sound humorous to an audience and after that one line the audience will refuse to take the rest of the play seriously, although no single individual in that audience would have thought the line humorous if he had been alone. With such possibilities before him there is little wonder that the dramatist considers the audience first, last and always; or that he envys at times the novelist who need never fear that one unfortunate line will ruin his work.

The question as to how many people must be present to form an audience cannot be answered by giving an exact number, but enough people must be assembled so that each individual may sink his own personality into that of the crowd. When the curtain rises the spectators are a diffuse mass of individuals. They are inclined to be restless, and are hardly what may be called an audience since they lack homogeneity. The reality of the outside world has not been shaken off and each is conscious of his own entity. The dramatist, therefore, must arrange his plot so that during the first few

minutes of the play nothing will be done or said which, if missed or misunderstood, will make any difference in understanding the play. The novelist begins with whatever scene he chooses. If he makes his opening paragraphs important and strong, he need not fear they will be any the less appreciated because they come first. The dramatist, however, cannot safely begin with an important scene even if such a scene is the logical opening of his play. He must often juggle the order of events for the sake of the audience, and must always be more prepared than any other artist to sacrifice sincerity of detail in order to set forth the truth of the whole. He must remember that what is truth to the individual is not necessarily truth to the crowd.

If the play interests the spectators, the separate individuals are fused into a unit, a homogeneous mass of humanity, thinking and feeling in the same way. It becomes a mob and is governed by the psychology of the mob. At every theatrical performance it is possible to watch the individuals melt into one mass. If the same play is watched night after night before different audiences in different cities it will be noticed that the fusion is complete sometimes in a very short space of time and often the process takes much longer. The more intellectual, the more thoughtful the listeners are, the longer the process of the melting pot takes. A *matinée* audience of young people and women rarely applauds as much as an evening audience; but it comes more quickly under the emotional dramatic spell. It is when the melting process is complete that the indescribable wave comes over the footlights to the players and a bond of sympathy is formed between them and the great unified mass of emotion out in the semi-darkness of the auditorium. A well-known actor has said that until this wireless communication was established his heart pounded with fear, but after it was established he was calm even in moments of simulated emotion.

The process of unification is carried on by certain persons who unconsciously become leaders and perform the same functions as the leaders of any mob or crowd. They are the people who are the first to enter into the spirit of a play and who, by their attitude, unwittingly influence their neighbors. If the play is serious, they are the first to become quiet and attentive, or very often they are the first to shed tears. At a comedy especially it is very easy to single out the leader of the mob by his hearty laughter. The rest of the audience follows in his wake quite unconsciously. The phe-

nomenon has been observed repeatedly that if, as often happens, the spectators begin by being amused at the too boisterous cachination of some person, they finally laugh not at but with its leader. Nor is this at all remarkable, for laughter and tears are as contagious as coughing and yawning. Indeed the whole system of the claue is founded upon the principle that a crowd can be influenced by certain applauding leaders. Although one deprecates the institution of a claue, there is no denying that professional applauders exert a great influence, providing their presence can be kept a secret.

Except on special occasions, practically every audience assembles in a peaceful frame of mind. It desires to be entertained legitimately and wants to laugh or weep, according to the nature of the play. However, let the performance, especially on a first night, be disappointing, and again another characteristic of the mob appears, that is, cruelty. Immediately something of the savage brutality of a crowd causes the otherwise kind and peaceful individuals, who are acting under the psychology of the mob, to inflict mental or physical pain on their fellow-men. The custom of throwing things at actors is as old as Greek drama, and while it is uncommon in this country yet only a year or two ago an actress was injured in New York in this way. As a general rule American audiences are not so prone to violent outbreaks; but they often heap ridicule on plays by derisive laughter and the newspaper critics reflect the cruelty of the mob in the acrimonious criticism sometimes turning into the personal insults which they heap upon the author. In Europe, however, the custom of hissing, booing and catcalling is universal. There is no form of art which is the target for such bitter criticism as is the drama. From time immemorial, not only has the dramatist been denied the aid of calm, judicial judgment; but he has been subjected, by the very nature of his art, to the capricious opinions of a crowd, which sometimes so far forgets itself as to be willing to inflict pain either physically or by ridicule, and it is difficult to say which hurts the more.

The audience, therefore, is less civilized, less sophisticated, than the majority of the individuals who compose it. Since the individual has given up part of his personality, he feels less responsible for his own judgment. He is influenced by those around him, and he ceases, in a measure, to think and reason. Just as mobs are notoriously governed by emotion, so the average theatre-goer calmly

stows his brains under his seat with his hat, and gives free play to his emotions. This state of mind is reflected on the stage, for there are few characters in drama who are conspicuous for their reasoning power, since the playwright knows well or feels instinctively that if his characters think and reason to the exclusion of feeling that the audience dwindles away. Thus in the seventeenth century in France the reasoning Corneille is deserted for the passionate Racine. When the cynical Voltaire tried to banish love from the stage he produced the "Death of Caesar," and the play died before its hero could. It has often been said that there must be a love interest in plays in order to please the women. It is true that women compose seventy per cent of theatrical audiences; but the real reason for the introduction of the love element lies in the fact that both the men and women of every theatrical audience are primarily emotional, at least as long as they are in the theatre. The unemotional man is not a theatre-goer. Of late we have heard too much of the influence of the tired business man on the drama; but he is a negligible quantity except for the fact that he pays for the seats which he rarely occupies. Likewise that rather vague but none the less existent class of people known as high-brows have little influence, for they talk more about plays than they go to see them and when they are in the theatre their intellectual attitude soon gives way to a free play of the emotions. A glance at any audience will reveal the fact that it is made up of the younger generation and women of all ages.

Since reason is thus partially banished from the stage, it follows that an audience cares more for an interesting situation than it does for the explanation of the causes and reasons for the existence of the situation. The passages in a novel of keen psychological analysis and of logical explanation which so delight the individual reader, bore him or escape him when he listens to them in the theatre. It is for that reason that such scenes are blue-penciled in a drama when it is performed, although the dramatist, writing with the psychology of the individual, felt compelled to introduce them and although they may well remain in the printed version of the play to be read in the quiet of the study, where the reader is in complete possession of his intellectual power. The logic of the drama is not the logic of the brain, but the logic of the heart. The audience, when it stops to question, does not ask if a character is acting according to reason, but if it is acting according to the

laws of human emotion. However, the audience rarely thinks. It is content to feel. The Italian critic of the sixteenth century, Castelvetro, was one of the first to point out that because of the audience, abstruse themes must be avoided and only elemental passions treated. In the old English play *Bartholomew Fair* when Leatherhead is asked if the drama is played according to the printed book, he replies: "By no means. That is too poetical and learned for our audience." Leatherhead was evidently not such a fool as his name implies; but perhaps if the play had been read by the individuals of his audience in their own homes, it would not have been found too learned for the majority.

The difference in standard between the individual reader and the crowd never appears more plainly than when the question of morality is brought up. The audience is less intellectual, less reasonable, more cruel and more emotional than the majority of the persons composing it; but, at the same time, its standard of morality is higher. The reader of a novel will accept without question the full description of certain characters and scenes which he will hardly allow to be suggested on the stage without a protest. In the eighteenth century in France when the people and the literature were anything but puritanical, the turbulent parterre often protested against mere peccadillos shown upon the stage, which would not have caused a ripple if represented in any other form of art which did not make its appeal to the public *en masse*. In New York the modification and withdrawal of certain plays which circulate freely in book form, is an instance of the feeling of moral responsibility of the audience. It is difficult to recall any period in modern times when the moral tone of drama has not been at least as high if not higher than the tone of other contemporary forms of literature. Yet the drama is attacked more often and more bitterly than any other form of art.

The result of this moral attitude on the part of the audience also has its influence on the dramatic technique. The naive laws of poetic justice no where else apply so strongly as to the drama. Aristotle criticizes the tragedies which end with the reward of the virtuous and the punishment of the bad, and he adds that such an ending is "accounted the best because of the weakness of the spectators; for the poet is guided in what he writes by the wishes of his audience." The novelist can end his story logically in accordance with human justice or human injustice. He can paint life

as it is; but the dramatist must follow certain prejudices of his audiences, which in late years are forcing the drama in regard to its ending almost to the state parallel to that of early East Indian drama in which an unhappy ending was actually forbidden by law. American audiences are especially naïve and childlike in this respect, and the result is that when European plays with an unhappy ending are produced in this country the dramatist is generally forced to change the outcome to a happy one whether it is logical or not.

Another limitation imposed upon the drama by the psychology of the audience lies in the fact that the chief character must be sympathetic. This is what Aristotle meant when he said that the protagonist must not be wholly bad and he always insists upon the necessity of an ennobled sympathetic character. The sins allowed a hero or heroine of a drama are very few. They are only sins of ignorance, like those of Oedipus, or they are sins of the emotions, which can be readily forgiven and understood by the emotional audience. The dramatist is, therefore, limited in the range of his chief characters. He cannot take as the principle subject for his psychological analysis a character whom the audience will merely pity, for the crowd wants something to admire. Exceptions to this rule are Richard III and Hedda Gabler; but they are merely exceptions and have been constantly attacked on the score of being entirely unsympathetic. The novelist, therefore, is free to choose and develop his characters in accordance with what he conceives to be the truth. Thus in one of O. Henry's stories a boy passes himself off to a mother as her long lost son whom he has killed, and no reader is shocked; but when that story was put on the stage the audience objected to a mother being so deceived as to take in her arms the murderer of her son. The play had to be altered to suit the psychology of the crowd; but it would be unfair to accuse the dramatist in such cases. When such changes are made in plays, it is generally done by the playwright himself because he realizes that the work he did alone at his desk does not seem to ring true to him as he becomes a part of an audience. If he could always write under the psychology of the mob instead of under the psychology of the individual he might well seem insincere to himself as a man, but wholly sincere to himself as a part of a crowd. The successful dramatist is the one who recognizes and feels in sympathy with the modified standards of the theatrical audience. Writing according to these standards is not

necessarily writing *down* to an audience. It is writing *for* an audience.

The crowd of spectators in a theatre, therefore, has a distinct individuality of its own. It resembles a human being on a large scale with rather primitive instincts. Since its intellectual power has given way to emotion the dramatist must assume its ignorance and yet he cannot rely on its ignorance. It wants nothing *recherché*—no caviar for the general. It has certain fundamental prejudices in favor of a stricter code of morals than that demanded for other forms of art. It is unsophisticated, almost childlike in its attitude of mind. It wants certain big—but only everyday—facts of life represented. Refinements of psychology do not appeal to it; for only certain primal passions drawn on broad lines can be understood by the crowd. It is more behind the times in its ideas than the majority of individuals composing it. In the development of art and science drama brings up in the rear. Thus the romantic movement in France was old before romantic drama succeeded. Balzac had produced the *Comédie Humaine* before realistic drama came to its own. Certain principles of impressionism which have long been practised in painting are looked upon today as a distinct novelty in scenery. The to-morrow of the drama is the yesterday of the separate arts which it employs, and the ideas it sets forth. The audience wants life represented not as the individual views life but as the crowd views it. Drama is, therefore, a chameleon on the spectrum of public opinion, changing only after the color of public opinion changes. Drama reflects social conditions but does not alter them. It chronicles reforms but it is not a means of reform, for the theatre is neither a schoolhouse, or a church, or a society for social reform. It is an art upon which great limitations are imposed and one of its greatest limitations lies in the fact that it must appeal to an audience often acting under the psychology of the mob. Whether one believes with Jonson that the "multitude is a beast," or with Carl Maria von Weber that "the individual is an ass and therefore the voice of the multitude is the voice of God," it is the multitude which conditions the art of the drama.

GENERAL SPECIALISTS

EVERETT LEE HUNT

Huron College

THE replies to my article upon the scientific spirit in public speaking were such fair and lucid statements of the demands of scholarship upon our profession that I take some credit to myself for the production of a valuable discussion, even tho the fallacies of my position be proved. It is therefore with the hope of calling forth critical replies that I attempt further argument.¹

The organization of the National Association of Academic Teachers of Public Speaking seems to mark a successful effort to establish a recognized profession. Since the days when biology first exacted tribute from sociology, and Herbert Spencer talked of the social organism, social organizations have become self-conscious with increasing rapidity, until today every group of men with common interests is eager for organization. Witness the tremendous growth of societies, clubs, fraternities, trade unions, and associations of all sorts. Journeymen craftsmen plied their trades for years before the guilds became powerful; but the academic position of Professor of Public Speaking had hardly been in existence long enough to obtain individual recognition until the national organization was effected. And, instead of being the outgrowth of the desire of men in long-established positions to come together with the sole object of mutual inspiration, the National Association is, partially, at least, the product of a desire to establish independent positions thru organization. The National Association of Academic Teachers of Public Speaking therefore, as other youthful academic societies, bears a closer resemblance to a labor union than to an academy of arts and letters. In this fact lies a great hope. The organization is of necessity democratic. None of its members hold positions which make their authority absolute. We now have in the National Association an effective organization unhampered by precedent or tradition.

The Association will not, however, long remain in this position. The authority of the body will inevitably tend to become concentrated in the hands of the ablest members. The power of precedent cannot be denied, and the early actions of the Association will

¹ See "A Problem in Pragmatism" immediately following.

exert an influence all out of proportion to their true significance. The ideals of the Association may be determined by two types of men. In the first place, the ideals may grow out of the actions of men, who having immediate reforms in view, take whatever steps are most favorable to the attainment of their ends. These men, having acted, will, upon the basis of their actions, build a philosophy. These are the men whose reason is given them to justify their actions. The second type is composed of men who may seem a bit impractical, men who are more interested in the construction of ideals than in immediate action. While it is impossible to deny the need for prompt action in many branches of Public Speaking, it would be well to pay some attention to ultimate ideals. Where are we going and why? What sort of a profession are we trying to create? Just what is our function in the educational world? In answering these questions we will be guided either by the intention of creating jobs which will give us the rewards we desire, or by the desire to do most effectively the work which we can and ought to do. Our desires are so determined by the possessions of our fellows that if the first motive be followed we will make it our ideal to make our departments in all respects like the recognized science departments. Desiring academic recognition, independence, and adequate salaries, we will standardize, build up a heavy technique, and insist that we as Public Speaking teachers have a separate field of knowledge as distinct as that of any other department. If, on the other hand, we are interested primarily in the work that most needs doing, not to create desirable jobs for deserving pedagogues, but to fill the greatest need in our college courses, we will question further before deciding to be in all things like as our brothers the scientists.

In repeating the oft-quoted statement that this is an age of specialization, in education as in other realms, it would be well for us to ask ourselves why, and to insist on being shown that specialization results in improvement wherever applied. It is easy to see at once why we have specialization in the science departments. As soon as enough new facts possessing sufficient unity to warrant a new grouping are discovered, a new department is created. These facts are discovered by special effort concentrated in comparatively narrow fields. Thus each science department owes its existence to specialization. Again, while this search for facts is the result of a love for truth, there is always, in the background of

consciousness, at least, the knowledge that a single scientific discovery will create a new industry or revolutionize an old one. Can it be purely the love for truth which is leading England to emphasize the necessity for scientific research after the war is over? While the scientist may be a disinterested scholar, it is the practical results that lead men to endow institutions of research. Thus the scientist owes the existence of his profession to specialization and all his rewards to the results of specialization. But how is it with the older parts of our educational system? By what strange fate are teachers of oratory, teachers of a discipline that was the crown of Greek and Roman education, now humbly attempting to creep back into our educational system under the guise of a new science discovered by a process of specialization! The truth is we specialize in speech science because others have specialized. We are like Dakota ranchmen gazing upon a territory which has been opened to homesteaders. Every new claim filed upon lessens his range. Not being upon friendly terms with the "honyockers" his only recourse is to leave the country or else file upon a quarter-section himself and be content within its narrow boundaries. All the sciences have staked out claims. Most of them have done it by discovering new territory. Their possession of permanent abiding places and consequent rise to power and influence have led them to demand that every intellectual activity have a home of its own. If Public Speaking cannot give its street and number it is suspected of staying out nights. To be homeless and a wanderer has its disadvantages, but Public Speaking would never be able to stay at home if it had one. It were the part of wisdom, therefore, to be on such friendly terms with all the proprietors of shanties of knowledge (to retain my western viewpoint) as to be sure of welcome as a visitor.

Having pointed out by way of introduction that the origin of the National Association of Academic Teachers of Public Speaking allows us great freedom in the formulation of our ideals, and secondly that the course of events by which training of students in Public Speaking came to be assigned to a particular faculty member does not warrant him in the assumption that he is a specialist, I wish to submit three assertions for consideration in determining some of the ideals of the association. First, neither speech science nor speech art can be confined to a particular field of knowledge. Second, any general acceptance of the idea that speech science or

speech art possesses a distinctive and individual field for specialization will prevent the instruction in Public Speaking from reaching its highest effectiveness. Third, the Professor of Public Speaking in a college finds his greatest work in stimulating, as a means to effective expression, a wide range of general reading and a keen interest in contemporary thought and action. In other words, the Public Speaking Professor must be a specialist in versatility.

The study of Public Speaking cannot be confined to one particular field of knowledge because speech art is not art and speech science is not science. John Galsworthy has defined art as "that imaginative expression of human energy which, thru technical concretion of feeling and perception, tends to reconcile the individual with the universal by exciting in him impersonal emotion." By impersonal emotion he means that "that is *not* art which, while he is contemplating it, inspires him with any active or directive impulse; that that *is* art, when, for however brief a moment, it replaces within him interest in himself by interest in itself." Ethel Puffer Howes Dench has also emphasized this well-known distinction. "We have a right to say that the aesthetic experience involves detachment, isolation, inhibition of action. However perfect the aesthetic moment, however harmonious and self-complete the ideal world in which we enter, it is none the less an interruption of real life. The aesthetic moment is a step out of life. . . . The aesthetic as applied to life is a contradiction of itself; because it is of the essence of life to be linked, and the essence of beauty is to be an isolated whole." Now it cannot be denied that this artistic isolation and detachment is often noticeable in elocutionary productions. Very possibly an excellent defence could be made for the predominance of the art motive in vocal interpretation of some forms of poetry. But it is undeniable that art for art's sake in oratory means the death of eloquence. To adapt a phrase from the article just quoted, it is of the essence of oratory to be linked. The supreme thing about oratory is its relationship to life and activity. Victor Cousin recognized this a half-century ago when he denied oratory a place among the fine arts. But it is unnecessary to elaborate this point. The National Association recognizes that Public Speaking is not contained within the field of art when it sets for itself a different scope of activity from the Speech Arts Association. Evidently the National Academic Association would make Public Speaking a science, and, as Professor Wool-

bert suggests, organize departments of speech science. I have no quarrel with the viewpoint of Professor Woolbert. His article is conclusive proof that he does not regard speech science as an addition to the realm of the known. The article, instead of telling of the discovery of a new science, is a plea for the academic recognition of the unity which exists among many long recognized factors. When such a unity is recognized it will be, not a thing in itself, but it will always be dependent upon a personality. Would any one attempt to make a scientific formula for the amount of history necessary to make a first-class speaker, or for the exact proportion which should exist between psychology and literature or economics? Since this cannot be done, the circle by which Mr. Woolbert has united so many branches of learning represents, not a science, but a personality. But the Public Speaking teacher who is determined to be a scientist may say that since the attempt to master all possible subject matter for speeches is futile, he will content himself with mastering the method of handling the subject matter. He will abstract from all the speeches he has read certain fundamental principles with which he will create a science. He then creates, however, not a science but a technique. Even the technique will be very imperfect as it is not applied to the same conditions twice. Since these facts are generally recognized and since Professor Woolbert's outline of a course, together with the University of Wisconsin outline, is broad and comprehensive, it may be asked why so much time should be spent in stating that the work of a Public Speaking department is not confined to one branch of knowledge and that such a department should not be called a science or an art department. It may seem like objection to the untruthfulness of the term sunset. But if emphasis is laid upon the department as an art department or a science department the supposition will soon become general that the Public Speaking teacher has a special field. From that will soon arise the idea that the Public Speaking teacher should be a specialist in the same sense as chemists or philologists are specialists. Public Speaking teachers will feel compelled to conform to the opinion of what they ought to be, which leads me to the second of my assertions, which is that any general acceptance of the idea that speech art and science possess a distinctive and individual field for specialization will prevent the instruction in Public Speaking from reaching its highest effectiveness.

The more we sacrifice to academic recognition, the more we attempt to imitate other departments in our organization, the more we will emphasize our points of similarity and minimize the points of difference. For a real development of our work, it is the points of difference that need to be emphasized. To emphasize the points of likeness is to make us specialists in technique. It cannot be denied that the technical field is large enough to supply many men with life tasks. And there are fields of usefulness for the technical expert in many of the professional schools of oratory or dramatic art. But in the liberal arts college there is no place for the mere technical expert. This is very different from saying that no teacher in a liberal arts college should be a specialist, but even here there is a marked distinction which must not be forgotten. The teacher of physics can fulfill the essentials of his task within the field of his specialized preparation. But for the Public Speaking teacher to attempt to fulfill his task within the limits of a specialized field is to fail in the most important part of his work. Such an attempt gives rise to the conception that the technique of a speech can be successfully abstracted from the subject matter and formalized; whereas it is a truism that you cannot separate the style from the man. But the average student who repeatedly goes thru the process of abstracting the mechanics of a speech can see no reason why it is not just as possible to start with the mechanics and add the subject matter. He plans like an architect and builds like a carpenter. Like Goody Rickby in Percy MacKaye's tragedy of the ludicrous, he would construct a scarecrow, expecting Dickon, or some other supernatural influence to breathe life into it. This constant separation of form and substance destroys all possibility of the functioning of the associative imagination. It makes impossible that complete union described by Ruskin in his chapters on the imagination.

"If, therefore, the combination made is to be harmonious, the artist must induce in each of its compound parts such imperfection as that the other shall put it right. If one of them be perfect by itself, the other will be an excrescence. Both must be faulty when separate, and each corrected by the presence of the other. If he can accomplish this the result will be beautiful; it will be a whole, an organized body with dependent members;—he is an inventor. If not, let his separate features be as beautiful, as opposite, or as resemblant as they may, they form no whole. They

are two members glued together. He is only a carpenter and a joiner."

In addition to the evils arising from the separation of form and substance, the technical specialist will have to assume responsibility for the growth of an idea that success in Public Speaking is to be attained by the mastery of a certain limited number of objective facts. I have frequently known students to refuse to respond to toasts or to make certain speeches which their positions demanded of them because, forsooth, they had not taken certain courses in Public Speaking. Oratory becomes indented with courses taken for credit. Faculty members often decline to act as judges on the grounds that they are not "up in the oratory business," as tho they expected oratory to be judged on much the same grounds as a stock show at the county fair. It is, of course, confessed that many contest orations require a sympathetic specialist to appreciate them. This belief that oratory is tied up with a few facts further gives rise to the belief that there are short cuts to eloquence. How many ambitious young men have spent their wages for the books and instruction of a certain "famous speech specialist" whose correspondence courses are widely advertised. The industrious clerk who spends his money because he has been persuaded that oratory is such an objective affair that, regardless of his personality or fund of general knowledge, fifteen minutes of study each evening will soon make him a convincing speaker, has been swindled.

The technical specialist in oratory soon comes to have a great faith in methods. He seems to believe that he can perfect a method and hand it to his fellow teachers as completely as he can bestow a copyrighted book. Dr. Blanton, in his contribution to the *Quarterly* for October, entitled "Scientific Truth," compares the Public Speaking teacher and his pupil to the Doctor and his patient. Dr. Blanton does not claim to establish his case by the use of this analogy; and certainly he does not expect to discover a serum which will make an orator of the "student who has a very high pitched voice, speaks very rapidly, and has a bad case of stage fright every time he gets up to speak." However, his analogy does lead him into an error. He assumes that all scientific research is of equal value, whether carried on in the field of Medicine or Public Speaking. Now it is obvious that a single discovery in chemistry may banish a disease, but Dr. Blanton would have difficulty in establishing any connection between the scientific knowledge of a period

and its oratory. You cannot by a revolutionizing discovery transform a stammering boy into an orator. The determination, however, to seek scientific methods, cannot but lay emphasis upon the importance of method. Just as Milton thought *Paradise Regained* a greater work than *Paradise Lost* because it had cost him greater effort, so your research worker will believe in the importance of a method according as he has toiled diligently in the perfection of it. Having established a "scientific truth" your researching teacher of Public Speaking is inclined to insist on using it. Very evidently Dr. Blanton is not a pragmatist. When he disapproves of the fact that "a great many teachers of Public Speaking are teaching things that are not true at all and yet are doubtless getting good results," we are led to suppose that he would be indifferent to results if only true methods were used. He shows your true scientist in preferring truth to results; and in addition seems to assert that there is no particular relationship between them. One wonders what William James would have said. As for myself, I am a pragmatist of sufficient credulity to judge of public speaking by its fruits. If every known eclipse of the sun had been followed by a plague, our scientists would agree with the Russian peasants in assuming a causal relationship. At any rate this is true: an *a posteriori* study of results in teaching Public Speaking will bring about variety and individuality in instruction; an *a priori* study of methods means uniformity and loss of personality.

Again, the technical specialist makes the mistake of assuming that the student comes to him with a mind well enough stored so that the whole problem of the teacher is a problem of expression. A brief acquaintance with college students ought to dispel this illusion. Even a cursory glance at the college curriculum is enough to show that a student will receive very little material of value for Public Speaking from his required courses. The elementary science work done by undergraduates may develop good memories and accurate observation, but it calls for no constructive thinking. Students of the languages rarely attain sufficient mastery of a foreign tongue to revel in its literature. The first courses in the English language are usually taught from a technical viewpoint. Not until the student reaches his Junior and Senior electives does he work in a field that is contributory to his work in Public Speaking. Even then it is the exceptional student who is sufficiently interested in his line of study to draw upon it with en-

thusiasm. To remedy this deficiency two expedients have been resorted to by the specialist teachers. The early training has been by means of declamation and speeches upon very simple subjects. Freshmen are asked to make speeches upon the new building or the football prospects. The other device is the introduction of contests. The use of simple subjects may be effective as far as elementary training in formal expression is concerned, but it is largely a waste of time from the point of view of increasing the intellectual interests of the student. The contests are not objectionable if they are, so to speak, the blossom of the Public Speaking plant; but where they are, as often, root, leaves and all, they are almost an unmitigated evil. Since the college courses do not supply the material for young speakers, and since devices for speaking without thinking are not preëminently successful, it is obvious that the student must get his material from reading which is done independently of all college requirements, reading which is done voluntarily in an attempt to satisfy intellectual curiosity. Before calling the students strictly to account and demanding such reading it might be well to inquire if college students *can* do any general reading. In the freshman year, required courses which demand considerably more work than the previous studies in high school, and the effort of adjustment to new surroundings, effectually prevent idle hours of browsing in the library unless the student be a confirmed "intellectual" before his arrival. Throughout the college course laboratory work and the writing of notes occupy many afternoons that were free to the men who were nurtured almost exclusively on the classics. The influence of the graduate schools is almost imperceptibly extending downward, creating in the college a tendency toward specialization. The democratization of the college has increased practical interests so that the concrete fact and the joy of activity constantly overshadow the abstract principle and habits of contemplation. The activities which Woodrow Wilson has called the side shows of the college circus are too well known to need emphasis. These activities make a very subtle appeal to the student's sense of duty under the guise of school or class loyalty. Many a student has felt that he was helping the "old school" along when he was practicing for the minstrel show. It seems selfish to employ the hours in solitary reading when so many interests are beckoning. Also the herd instinct is nowhere stronger than in the college, and to defy it is

disastrous. It is, therefore, a difficult matter to point out when a student *could* read, even were he endowed with the inclination. The same influences which deprived the students of their time for general reading were almost fatal to that time-honored institution of college life, the literary society. Interest in oratory and debate dwindled almost to nothing. To remedy the situation some of the colleges established chairs of Public Speaking, a thing unknown and unnecessary under the old dispensation. This custom spread rapidly until almost every college now gives a place in the curriculum to that which used to be pursued purely as an intellectual sport. These Public Speaking teachers now often cover the field of politics, literature, economics and sociology much after the fashion of the general reader of former years.

In fact, when the teacher of Public Speaking faces things as they are, he realizes not only that narrow specialization will not produce the best results, but he will realize that, in view of the narrow range of reading covered by the average student, specialization upon technique is futile. He will realize that his greatest work is in stimulating, as a means to effective expression, a wide range of general reading and a keen interest in contemporary thought and action, which is the last of the assertions with which I am now concerned. The Public Speaking department is to serve as a clearing house of ideas. The instructor should inspire in his students a vital interest in the affairs of the world, in politics, sociology, economics, literature, and art. He must realize with Cicero that all the arts which pertain to culture, have, as it were, a common bond; and he should make his students realize it. Too many students are graduating without the slightest realization of the relationship of the various departments in which they have worked. They have no vivid sense that we live in a universe instead of a multiverse. To the question, "Has't any philosophy in thee?" they can only reply with a stare. To accept the function of a general specialist, to be chiefly a stimulator of thought, to refuse to accept the limits of one department is not making a smaller intellectual demand upon the teachers of Public Speaking, it is increasing it. It means that while other departments are progressively specializing, we must return to the intellectual ideal of the college president of a century ago who could fill any chair in the institution, even tho we realize the impossibility of actually doing so.

Such a possibility may not bring immediate academic recognition. It may take some time for specialists of a certain type to admit the worth of any profession different from their own. But since there is a real need in our colleges for such chairs of general culture, since the value of such work is indisputable, teachers of such a type may face the future with confidence.

A PROBLEM IN PRAGMATISM

C. H. WOOLBERT
University of Illinois

IT IS exceedingly difficult to meet a contention like Mr. Hunt's without incurring great dangers. His paper¹ is an adroitly fortified piece of argument. If I focus on his objections to a certain article of mine, I run the risk of seeming to plead a special cause. If I argue for extension of courses in public speaking or insist on the need of a department separate from others, I am open to the charge of providing more and better jobs for myself and my ilk. If I plead for organization, division of labor, and specialization, I drag down our high calling to the level of others which are of the earth earthy. If I insist on standardization, the investigation of facts, and the establishment of laws, then I am killing the spirit by excessive attention to mere technique. And yet I must do all these things and so run the risk of these very charges.

Mr. Hunt and I differ so widely as to fundamentals that it cannot be said we are arguing. We are merely stating personal preferences; and these preferences very naturally arise from our past and present experiences. I was trained at such and such colleges; Mr. Hunt, I know not where; I teach in one type of institution, he in another; my studies have taken one bent, his a different. It is inevitable that we cannot view the matter with the same eyes; we are not pressed by the same needs, and are not seeking the same immediate ends. Hence, we differ as members of different species.

I can sum up my attitude promptly and simply by raising a question: When two men seeking the same general aim can be so far apart as we two are with respect to the method of achieving this aim, is it not high time that some method of composing their differences be formed other than the stating of personal preferences? I stand for a search for the facts; the facts of how speaking is done; of what its various effects are under specified conditions; how these facts can be made into laws and principles; and how other people can best be taught to apply them. The facts we use are too often guesses; our methods are too purely personal; we need to get together on some common acceptable basis. The only one I know of comes from scientifically conducted investigation and research.

¹ See article "General Specialists" immediately preceding.

Hence I stand for research; also I deem it impossible to do successful teaching without laws and principles; I do not believe that the necessary courses can be devised and taught except as they are organized under a unified interest in a separate and independent department; and I know thoroughly well that our universities are not going to make way for a discipline that cannot furnish the facts, the laws, and the unified interest. The university has no guest chamber and no chair for nomads. Only members of the household can sit in the house where *?* happen to be living; all our guests are looked upon as tramps and they get short shrift at our dug-out. Very inhospitable, yes, but true just the same.

Mr. Hunt and I are of different epochs and countries. He is of a romantic golden age, I, of the common, ignoble now. He is from Greece, I am from Germany(!)—he probably by choice, I perforce. He cries out for the glory that was Greece and the grandeur that was Rome; I am surrounded by laboratories and card catalogues. Consequently when we talk about the problems of public speaking, we aren't talking about the same thing at all. He confines his horizon to a specific kind of development of the given individuals; others of us, while not ignoring this at all, also peer out to find new boundaries and wider reaches; we are making more work for these individuals.

Another way of making clear the fundamental personal difference between it is to point out that I am studying a problem in administration for a university, while Mr. Hunt is fairly and frankly concerned in the problem as it applies to a college. I think Mr. Hunt overlooked this fact in his strictures of my article on organization of a department for universities. I tried to be explicit on that point and hereby express regret that I was not entirely successful. As a matter of fact, the whole issue comes to a head at this very point. And are not both of us right? As I said at the opening, we are not fighting each other; we aren't talking about the same thing. My circumstances compel me to accept the university's definition of a professor as 'one who finds and teaches truth.' We inmates of the universities simply are not permitted to overlook the concept "find." In the colleges it is different; they have more liberties. I taught in one ten years, and I appreciate the college attitude. Ability to teach and personality are almost everything in the college, and the kind of teacher the college likes best is the "general specialist." I have been one, a

sort of a lay pastor, an intellectual and spiritual knight errant, an educational court physician. It is a delightful task, full of rare privileges and uplifting opportunities. But—and here is the crux—that is all “shoved behind me” for I have accepted a job in a university. And if I were to stake my life here on any talents as a community Paul or St. Francis, I should be eaten alive by the lions of science and the tigers of organization that by day and night scour this arena. The university problem is vitally different from that of the college, and the sooner university men get that into their heads, the farther our subject will get both as a living-making occupation and as a humanity-helping profession.

I have little disposition to make an attack upon the individual statements in Mr. Hunt's paper to which I take exception; in the first place they are too numerous, and in the second, I think I can sum up all my objections in a further statement of my own attitude. I am very willing he should have his feelings and I sympathize with him in possessing them; but they are the other pole to mine, and we can easily keep out of a dispute by frankly admitting this at the start.

However, it would seem like an evasion if I should pass by Mr. Hunt's three “assertions” without notice. Let me, then, state how my attitude and philosophy explains away these “assertions.”

1. “Neither speech science nor speech art can be confined to a particular field of knowledge.”

As this is a flat contradiction of my contention on organization of departments for universities² it suggests a real head-on collision. Mr. Hunt says of my position: “His article is conclusive proof that he does not regard speech science as an addition to the realm of the known. The article, instead of telling of the discovery of a new science, is a plea for the academic recognition of the unity which exists among many long recognized factors. When such a unity is recognized it will be not a thing in itself, but it will always depend upon a personality.” This offers an excellent challenge to battle, but what is the use? We look at this matter with such different eyes that we cannot see even starting ground in common. I seem to have failed completely in getting my point into Mr. Hunt's consciousness. My emphasis must be defective. I try to bring out by means of the circles that there is a fertile field unclaimed that needs tilling; all Mr. Hunt sees is that I have suggested that we

² *Quar. Jour. of Pub. Sp.*, Vol. II, No. 1, Jan., 1916, pp. 64-77; “The Organization of Departments of Speech Science in Universities.”

have territory in common with other owners. (I might have said "ranchers.") My main point—important to my attitude—is lost on Mr. Hunt because the minor point fits his attitude much better. But I still believe in a separate field possessed of many facts now and capable of yielding many more, centered around a unified human interest, and to be developed most advantageously as a separate discipline and body of knowledge.

I cannot help feeling that my error lies more in using a certain name than in my subject matter. I suspect that I am merely encountering one more person who doesn't like the name "speech science." One man I know almost had a convulsion over it. He immediately wanted me to prove that I could see a science like Chemistry of Physics or Biology—what one educator calls "infinite sciences." I think he felt better when I made clear to him that the "science" I see is synonymous with the disciplines known under the names "political science," "household science," "library science," "military science," "sanitary science." I used the word science because universities like it much better than "art"; they are afraid of art. I know colleges are not, but universities are. Yet the name is only secondary. A glance at the subjects for courses will show that I am a pretty ardent advocate of teaching art as well as science.

Now for the assertion that "neither speech science nor speech art can be confined to a particular field of knowledge." The statement is self-contradictory. If there is such a thing as speech science, it inevitably has to be confinable to a particular field of knowledge. Otherwise it is not science. For, what is a science? I will quote one characteristic definition:³ "A science consists of a large body of observed facts, which are related to one another, and are arranged under general laws." On what basis, then, are facts chosen to make a science? The same authority tells us:⁴ "Every science takes up a certain attitude towards the world of human experience, or regards it from a definite point of view, and it is the business of science to describe the world as it appears after the attitude has been taken or the point of view adopted. What differentiates the sciences is just this difference of human interest."

Now if the readers of my article have not seen that I was trying to outline a field of knowledge that centered around a unified interest and a certain attitude of the world of human experience—a field mostly fallow but very rich in human values—, they merely

³ Titchener, E. B., *A Textbook of Psychology*, p. 1, N.Y., 1913.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 4.

prove me weak at making myself clear. The presence of the many circles around the large one is simply to show how slight a claim the English department has upon us; that other departments have a claim just as good, and that the logic of the case calls for a separation from any patronizing department. Yet we all ought to know that universities are not willing to make a new department unless the subject can show that it possesses a "large body of observed facts, which are related to one another, and are arranged under general laws." I was not discussing what the colleges do; my article was speaking solely for the universities. But there! I have laid myself open to the charge of making jobs and preferment for me and my friends! Whoso cares to draw such a gratuitous conclusion is welcome to do so. If my objector had said that the field of speech (not merely speaking) has not been laid out, we should agree; however, he said it *cannot* be laid out. I am still willing to pit my whole article against his proposition.

I could go on with this theme at great length; I could point out that no new field of learning is found freed from contact and even overlapping with others—there are no educational islands; I could point out that my discussion of speech (science or art) is very much broader than the making of *a* speech, a fact Mr. Hunt seems to have overlooked; I could discuss the difference between the broad view of speech science and art in all its ramifications, involving as it does voice, phonology, theory of expression, speaking, reading, interpreting, acting, and speech-composition as against the restricted view of preparing a student to make a given speech; and I could point out that my use of the circle was not intended to show the possible subject matter of *a* speech, but the factors involved in getting at the facts of speech, speaking, reading, and acting in all their numerous manifestations. And most important of all, I could point out that I was trying to suggest a unified basis for discovering laws, laws that will work and laws that will rest on something more solid than one man's personal attitude or the dicta of a coterie; something better than the "assertions" of any of us.

2. But the search for laws comes head on against Mr. Hunt's second assertion: "Any general acceptance of the idea that speech science or speech art possesses a distinctive and individual field for specialization will prevent the instruction in public speaking from reaching its highest proficiency." This is a point of view so novel to me that I am at a loss where to grapple it. My first thought is

to gasp out, "When men can differ so widely as to the facts of speech and how to teach it, is it not high time to specialize our field and find out something about them?" But that will unquestionably have no force upon Mr. Hunt. Again I can do nothing but state my attitude. (Oh, that men had by now submitted such problems to research and then we could drop these personal attitudes, both of us!) As it is now, one says, "'Tis," the other says "'Taint," and that's as far as we shall ever get until we have found a way of getting facts that have substantial foundation.

This very contention opens up a dispute as old as the teaching of our subject:- Shall we teach on a basis of technique or not? The problem is too large to settle in a short paper; it needs patient and minute research. Evidently Mr. Hunt teaches without technique. I couldn't get along without it. But for any of us to wipe the other out with assertions is too easy. I shall not try, I have already expressed my opinion on this subject;³ my attitude remains the same as before, and as long as my experience bears me out, it will probably not change until empirical investigation, scientifically carried on proves me wrong. Nor can we refer it for adjudication to Galsworthy or Dench or Ruskin or Shakespeare or the Bible.

I have to confess that my experience as a shepherd of ideas in a college makes me very sympathetic toward the attitude that cries out against specialization;—let me move to amend by substituting the word *over* specialization. I am guilty of being something of an intellectual philanderer; I have violent attachments for kindred spirits and I revel in the company of fellow pilgrims to Parnassus. I even sigh for the good old days when the teacher was not a member of a labor union and could ride Pegasus at a jog trot if he wished. Sometimes I can even understand why John Ruskin shook his fist at the nasty factories and the horrid railroad trains. But I happen to be teaching in a university that offers courses in ceramics and animal husbandry, soil physics and business administration, cement construction and the selection and preparation of food. Keeping my eyes open I have had it forced upon me that the age of specialization is here, and if we are going to live in this age we shall have to knuckle under. At least it is so in Denmark—I mean the universities!

But why make specialization a bugaboo? To me it is as necessary to the achievement of our highest and loftiest ends—not merely

³ *Quar. Jour. of Pub. Sp.*, Vol. I, No. 2, July 1915, p. 127, "Theories of expression, some criticisms."

our desire to create jobs—as it is to the chemist, the philologist, or the economist. You see some of us still believe that we cannot teach any subject without rules and laws and even technique. We are hopeless on that point. We believe that any teaching must rest on analysis; that the results of analysis offer a basis of criticism; that criticism helps synthesis; and that best results always show a synthesis arising from intelligent criticism, which in turn rests on accurate analysis. Hence we need rules, laws, and the other deadly sins. But in saying this we by no means commit ourselves to the necessity of making rules our master and ourselves their slaves. Rules are tools; we can always keep the mastery over them if we know how and if we will to do so. I for one am still a small boy in the face of interesting phenomena; I always want to know why? how? and again why? I have the elemental desire to take things apart to see what makes them tick. And once I have found out and try to tell others how to do it, I impulsively attempt to state the guiding principle so he can know *how*. Teaching I conceive to be a process of *showing how*; and apart from sheer imitation it must rest on rules and technique.

Accepting the doctrine, then, that if we are to teach we must have laws, I have no destination but the advocacy of research. I have to bring up at that terminal once I board the train on the technique railway. He who says "*A bas technique*" needs not research; that is perfectly obvious. How we can ever settle our quarrel is hard to see—except by scientifically conducted empirical investigations. But then that begs Mr. Hunt's question just as he begs mine by his assertion that there cannot be a separate field needing investigation. And there we are!

I think this covers my attitude with respect to the evils of technique, the curse of specialization, the wrong of imitating the standards of other departments, the impossibility of separating form and substance, and the unwisdom of being a technical specialist.

One point more I must touch upon: for the life of me I cannot get Mr. Hunt when he seems to imply that the whole problem that confronts our profession is one of manipulating matter for speeches. I refused to believe the evidence before me as I read his paper, until his reiteration and amplification left me no chance to doubt that his idea is, that when we teach public speaking we only teach how to gather and use ideas for speeches. He conceives my circles (representing departments related to us) only as sources of speech material. I wonder on what basis he thought I left out

theology and biology and chemistry and railway administration, etc., some of which furnish excellent material. But it merely comes back to this: Mr. Hunt honestly cannot see anything like a separate science in speech matters; naturally enough, then, he cannot see that I was merely showing that no one discipline could swallow us up, that we had as much use for some of their laws as they have, and that some of them have no other function with us than to furnish us with raw materials. When he speaks of "a scientific formula for the amount of history necessary to make a first-class speaker" he seems willing to make out that I have been talking mere nonsense. I resent the perversion of my intent, and reply only by restating my utter inability to understand how a teacher of speech can think that speech composition is our whole and only problem. If I am unfair in this assumption I apologize here and now; but my mistake will be only in my failure to understand what Mr. Hunt has written. Here again we are at opposite poles. My work calls for a study of voice, vocal methods, standards and laws of expression, interpretation, reading, acting, staging of plays, and many matters other than composing speeches. My article made a plea by implication for this wider field, if I did not make it clear, once more it was my powers of expression that were at fault.

Again, I scratch my pate over the notion that the only way to learn a technique of speech-making is to abstract it from speeches already written or uttered. It is a new comet swimming into my ken. I profess to be able to see lots of ways of building a technique of speaking without ever abstracting a single oration or argument; especially a technique of voice, reading, and acting. I still believe that Mr. Hunt and I are not talking about the same thing at all. For further details see article above referred to in the January, 1916 *Quarterly*, page 74, sub-head *d*, top of the page.

This leads me to the strictures made upon the remarks of Dr. Blanton. I do not hesitate to say that here I think Mr. Hunt lapsed in his fairness. He tries to reduce Dr. Blanton to an absurdity by such an obvious device as reading more into words than the writer intended. When a man argues for improvement and increased horizon, must he therefore be charged with arguing for a revolution and wild vagaries? I think the statement "You cannot by a revolutionizing discovery transform a stammering boy into an orator" does little credit to the fairness or the perspicacity of

the man who wrote it. In the first place, maybe a boy could be⁷ so transformed; who knows? Greater miracles have occurred. In the second place, it is an arrant perversion of Dr. Blanton's meaning. From all I have said, obviously I stand with the man who wants to get at the facts, to classify these facts, and to find ways and methods of using them for the good of the race—not only facts for the making of a speech, but the facts of how speaking is and should be carried on. The real scientist will care little, while he works, whether he is going to create a revolution or not; but a "general specialist" simply cannot understand that attitude; otherwise he could not be general enough in his specializing.

The exclamations about Dr. Blanton's pragmatism are poorly conceived. Laying aside the attempt to settle the matter with an epithet, there is not the slightest need of discovering an inconsistency in Dr. Blanton's words, "a great many teachers of public speaking are teaching things that are not true at all, and yet are doubtless getting good results." To make this necessarily an absurdity is entirely gratuitous. I see Dr. Blanton's point clearly; I have that kind of eyes. He means that while some of us, with the workers in all arts, even in our ignorance do not spoil our bright pupils and possibly help the most of them, yet if we knew more than we do now, we could do much better than we are doing. I call that a very sensible and plausible proposition; though that rests on an attitude again. We need not tease any absurdity from it, either on the basis of preferring truth to results—as if there could be any sin in it if we should—or of wondering about the reactions of William James, peace to his ashes.

3. The third assertion remains. Paraphrased it is, We must be general specialists, not technical specialists. My criticisms of this must be obvious by now. Of course, we must help make well-rounded men of our students; far beyond other teachers we have a great opportunity. If any member of the profession gets more fun out of it than I do, I envy him sincerely. Even in an institution with six thousand communicants I am something of a mental hedge priest and father confessor. And I sympathize feelingly with my colleagues who find their charges empty of head and dead of heart. I count it a personal privilege to be in a profession that offers unusual opportunities to fill the one and vitalize the other. But I find that the task is too great; I can only touch a stray life here and there among the thousands. In other words, this de-

lightful occupation can be to me only an avocation, not my vocation. To provide enough teachers to be general specialists would be to set up a whole monastery in our midst. It would require about fifty on the speech staff at the University of Illinois to do a really first-class job of the general specialist business. We still have to trust to the economist and the historian and the teacher of literature to do most of the head-filling. Then we teach how to unload—*how*, mind you. We are a machine for unloading much more than for loading.

I fear there is to be no return to the good old days of Mark Hopkins and the general utility college teacher. The tide is moving the other way. Some of us can shed genuine tears over the passing of "general culture," but, in the old sense of that term, it is most certainly becoming a rare article. At our universities it almost takes its place in the museum with the passenger pigeon and the great auk. The colleges still keep it alive, and may they be blessed in their efforts. But not all of us can teach in colleges, and so we have no choice but to drop a tear, strew a few flowers, and go the ways that know it no more. We elect—partly for the sake of our jobs and, if you will believe it, partly for other reasons,—to be investigators, students, and technical specialists. And some of us have just enough faith in facts, laws, and method to believe that therein is the way of salvation and now is the accepted time.

Yet, after all is said and done, Mr. Hunt rests his case upon rock bottom. We indeed ought to be general specialists. It is the highest attainable ideal. The best teaching in the world has been done under the direction of general specialists. And ours is not the only discipline that works best that way. The same privilege once belonged to the teacher of political science, literature, economics, household science, sociology, theology, and philosophy. The ultimate ideal of all education centers in generally specializing. The highest manifestation of it can be found in the training given in the middle Nineteenth Century English home of culture. The home taught the sons and daughters their literature, their social sciences, (so-called!), their theology, and their philosophy. And if our American homes were what some of us would like to see them become, the arch general specialists, father and mother and the rest of the family, could do a much better job of educating than all the professors (note the resemblance to the word 'professional') in the land. But education has been farmed out; division of labor

is inevitable; organization and specialization have overmastered us. We may wish we could escape, but we cannot. It is all a matter of the higher and more practical pragmatism; we cleave to the system which works best. Mr. Hunt's works best under his set of circumstances, mine under another. So what is the answer? I can only say that in an age of organization and specialization I am for specializing and organizing; where technique is demanded, I yield to it if I can do so without sin; and where the old order changes I turn with maybe a tinge of sadness—in never-failing hope to the new.

MODERN PRINCIPLES OF VOICE TRAINING

HETTIE F. AMSDELL

AS A PREPARATION for working out a course in voice training, it was decided to consider what has been offered in the late books on this subject. The books examined have all been written since 1908, and so offer the latest suggestions in the matter of voice and voice training. They are:

Voice Production in Singing and Speaking, by Wesley Mills, M.A., M.D., F.R.S.C. (1913). J. B. Lippincott Co., Philadelphia.

The Voice—An Introduction to Practical Phonology, (1910), by W. A. Aikin, M.D. Longmans, Green & Co., New York.

The Natural Method of Voice Production, by Floyd S. Muckey, M.D., C.M. (1915). Charles Scribner's Sons, New York.

The Speaking Voice. (1908) by Katherine Jewell Everts. Harper and Bros., New York.

Mind and Voice, Principles and Methods in Voice Training. (1910) by S. S. Curry, Ph.D., Litt.D., Expression Co., Copley Square, Boston.

English Diction—Part I—The Voice in Speech. (1915) by Clara Kathleen Rogers. Published by the author. 309 Beacon St., Boston.

Voice and Nerve Control. (1915) by Jutta Belle-Ranske. Frederick A. Stokes & Co., New York.

These books fall naturally into three classes: those which have been written by physicians and physicists, men well trained in the science of voice, but who confine their suggestions in voice training solely to the questions of conditions for tone and tone-production; those by teachers of vocal expression who emphasize the training of the voice with little or no emphasis upon the science of voice; those by teachers of singing, who, though no doubt very successful in their teaching, have had little or no scientific training.

The books by Drs. Mills, Aikin, and Muckey belong to the first class, those by Miss Katherine Jewell Everts and Dr. Curry to the second, and those by Miss Clara Kathleen Rogers and Mrs. Jutta Belle-Ranske to the third.

In his preface to *The Voice, an Introduction to Practical Phonology*, Dr. W. A. Aikin tells us that "the present work is addressed principally to those whose profession it is to train the speaking or singing voice, and therefore certain scientific and technical principles are dealt with somewhat minutely. . . . In making use of these materials so far as they go, I do not propose a special 'method' of teaching, but a foundation for all methods, which scientific truth is alone capable of establishing."

He has made a special study of phonology, which he defines as the science of vocal sound, and lays especial emphasis upon the importance of phonology in the training of the voice. The chapters dealing with this phase of the subject are profusely illustrated, and can be recommended highly. He holds that teachers should have a knowledge of phonology in order "to enable them to understand the vocal principles they are to apply in their teaching of language, speech, and song. . . . The linguist, elocutionist, and musician can no longer be accepted as authorities upon vocal science" (pp. 4-5).

In his consideration of the purely physical form or nature of the voice, Dr. Aikin likens its general structure to that of a "single reed-pipe of a church organ" (p. 6) whose action may be divided as follows:

- "(1) A wind-chest, into which air is pumped by bellows.
- (2) A vibrator or reed, which produces vibrations, and is the source of sound.
- (3) A resonance chamber or resonator, which modifies the sound by giving it particular qualities" (p. 6).

Following this order he states that "the cultivation of the voice thus resolves itself into a three-fold process, to be undertaken in the following order:-

- "(1) The development of the capacity and conscious control of the breath.
- (2) The conscious establishment of well-arranged positions and movements of the resonator which are to become half-conscious habits of speech.
- (3) The free and unhampered use of the vocal vibrator in its natural relation to mental sound-perceptions and under the dominion of the breath" (p. 11).

Here we have the very essence of Dr. Aikin's theory of voice training. His whole problem now is to give the scientific facts con-

cerned with the three-fold process he outlines. His chapters on the anatomy and physiology of tone production are scientifically sound, and his work on the formation of the vowel sounds is especially valuable. He gives, not only the physiology, but the physics of tone production.

Although he lays no claim to any "method" in voice training, he does suggest some breathing exercises. He advises practicing breathing exercises while walking in order to gain freedom, but the value of this advice may be questioned.

In his last chapter he gives some suggestions for vocal education and carefully outlines a course in phonological instruction.

Dr. Aikin makes no attempt to train the modulations of the voice, in fact he questions the advisability of directing "the inflections of the voice too much for fear of introducing unnatural ones" (p. 103).

His book would be of great value in developing the fundamentals of voice training, and no teacher would go far amiss with this book for his authority.

Dr. Wesley Mills, emeritus professor of physiology in McGill University, and lecturer on vocal physiology and hygiene in the McGill University Conservatorium of Music, Montreal, has written: *Voice Production in Singing and Speaking*, a book which is a valuable contribution to the literature on voice training.

The author's interest in music has led him on and on in his efforts to discover the underlying principles of tone-production and their application to the human voice in speech and song. He is most emphatic in demanding that teachers of singing and speaking have thorough and scientific training for their work, especially in view of the great harm they may do by unskilful teaching "Such delicate mechanisms can also be easily injured or hopelessly ruined; and, as a matter of fact, this is being done daily. A great musical periodical has made the statement that thousands of voices are being ruined annually, in America alone, by incompetent teaching" (p. 22).

Like Dr. Aikin, he divides the voice mechanism into three main parts: the breathing apparatus, the vibrator, and the resonating chambers. He lays especial stress upon the value of breathing in tone production holding that "the one absolutely essential thing for singers and speakers is breathing" (p. 44). He devotes three chapters to a full consideration of this subject, closing with a list

of carefully graded exercises for its development. He then proceeds to the study of the larynx and the resonating chambers. No other writer has given such a simple, clear, and accurate description of these parts as has Dr. Mills. The diagrams and illustrations, of which there are many, are of a very high grade, and add much to the value of the book.

Coming to the question of the training of the voice mechanism he works from the principle that "he sings or speaks best who obtains the end with the least expenditure of energy" (p. 184). It is the duty then of the singer or speaker to establish habits of correct voice production. The book can be recommended highly to anyone who is at all interested in the subject of voice training.

The Natural Method of Voice Production on Speech and Song, by Floyd S. Muckey, M.D.C.M., is a new departure in the field of voice training. In collaboration with the late Professor William Hallock, Professor of Physics at Columbia University, the author has made a careful study of the physics as well as of the anatomy and physiology of tone production. Until the appearance of this book all the authorities on voice training, including Drs. Mills, Aikin, and Curry, and Miss Everts, were agreed that breathing is the primary factor in the production of tone. Dr. Muckey, however, bases his method upon the natural law that "correct voice production may be summed up as 'non-interference with the action of the vocal cords and full use of resonance'" (p. 77). (See also VI, p. 25.) The breath is a secondary cause because it can neither originate the air-waves, determine the rate at which they are originated, nor reinforce them for the production of volume and quality of tone" (p. 98).

Interference is the result of the fact that the action of the tone-producing muscles is involuntary, while that of the interfering muscles is voluntary. Therefore, "we have in the throat two sets of muscles whose action is antagonistic." (pp. 68-69) For convenience "the swallowing muscles are termed the extrinsic muscles, and the vocal muscles the intrinsic muscles of the larynx (p. 69).

Dr. Muckey shows very clearly the principal forms of interference: "the contraction of the muscular fibers of the false vocal cords, which prevents the free vibration of the true vocal cords; second, the contraction of the muscles of the soft palate, which prevents the use of at least one-half the resonance space; and third, the contraction of the muscles of the chin and the back of the

tongue, which prevents the correct action of the pitch mechanism" (The larynx) (pp. 69-70).

The natural method is built upon these fundamental facts and the object of the exercises suggested is "first to break up the association between the articulating and the extrinsic muscles, and second, to develop the intrinsic muscles." Since "the fundamental principle of muscular development is contraction and relaxation without strain" (p. 83) the author recommends the use of *short soft* tones for practice. "Practice on loud and sustained tones is entirely contrary to the fundamental principle of musculature, and, hence, of voice development" (pp. 89-90). As for the matter of breathing, Dr. Muckey contends that "voice production without interference needs only a little breath and the singer or speaker breathes accordingly" (p. 104). But if resonance is restricted by means of interference, "a much wider vibration of the vocal cords must make up for this loss of resonance. This calls for a large expenditure of breath" (p. 102).

The author makes no claim of offering anything for the development of the modulations of the voice, in fact he states plainly that "this book deals with voice production and not with interpretation" (p. 14).

Dr. Muckey's book is a remarkable work and should be carefully studied by everyone interested in voice training. It is altogether possible that too much emphasis has been laid upon the importance of breathing and too little upon the development of resonance as a factor in tone production. The exercises suggested should find a prominent place in any course in voice training.

In taking up the book written by Miss Katherine Jewell Everts, *The Speaking Voice*, we find the subject considered from the mental rather than the physical point of view. Miss Everts makes no attempt to give any of the anatomy or physiology of the voice mechanism, "for the process of tone production, so far as it concerns us, is not of physiological, but rather of psychological significance" (p. 3). Her purpose is to offer "a method of voice training which is the result of a deliberate effort to simplify and condense, for general use, the principles which are fundamental to all recognized systems of vocal instruction." (Preface)

She divides her course into three parts: The Tuning of the Instrument, the Technique of the Instrument, and Studies in the Vocal Interpretation of Literature, which belongs wholly to the field of vocal expression.

The book is written in simple style and is very readable. The author has succeeded in making Part I, "The Tuning of the Instrument," very helpful to the general student of voice training. Each process is divided into three main steps, an explanation of her purpose, directions as to how this purpose may be accomplished, and exercises for practice. Special emphasis is laid upon the thought side of the act of breathing for tone.

Being a reader and teacher of vocal expression, she naturally emphasizes that side of vocal training. Part II of her book, which has to do with the development of the modulations of the voice, seems very inadequate. She gives but one problem for the development of change of pitch; and the chapter on "Inflections" is also inadequate. The subject is considered entirely from the point of view of vocal expression, and is too difficult for beginning students.

The main value of the book lies in the simple, easy presentation of the questions of supporting, freeing and re-enforcing the tone, and a careful study of these chapters would prove helpful to any teacher of voice-training.

Mind and Voice—Principles and Methods in Voice Training, by Dr. S. S. Curry, is the result of over thirty years of study and teaching. This book falls into Division II of our classification, its emphasis being upon the close relation of mind, body, and voice.

The fundamental principle upon which he bases his work is that "preparation for tone implies a direct response of the body to the mind immediately before the tone is produced. This response consists in taking breath resulting in a sympathetic, elastic fullness or activity in the middle of the body, and a simultaneous passivity and opening of the throat or tone passage. Wherever these conditions are reversed, or in any way interfered with, there will be imperfect tone production, and whatever tends to establish them will make the voice easy, natural, and strong" (p. 18). Throughout the book, special emphasis is laid upon the relation between the taking of breath and the opening of the throat. Going further in the relation of mind, body and voice, he finds that "simultaneously with this, the reception of the impression causes an expansion of the chest and elevation of the body. . . . This sympathetic union of all the conditions of the body and voice, though a fundamental step, is yet one of the most neglected of all in vocal training. It has been the least understood or observed" (pp. 25-26).

The next step in the process is the establishment of these primary conditions for the purpose of tone production. This is accomplished "by the impulses of thought and feeling" (p. 32). Special emphasis is laid upon the fact that "in this book the voice is always considered as dependent upon thinking and feeling" (p. 42). Here we have the foundation of Dr. Curry's principles of voice training.

A discussion of this book leads inevitably to the question as to how far vocal expression and voice training are related. To Dr. Curry the relation is very close, and it is an open question whether his book is more a text on vocal expression or voice training.

After devoting two chapters to establishing his primary principles and explaining the need of training he goes on to a discussion of breathing, tone production, and the development of modulations and tone-color.

While Dr. Curry has made a very remarkable contribution to the subject of voice training, the lack of concise, orderly arrangement, detracts much from the value of his book, and makes it hard to follow, at least for anyone who has not studied with him. He suggests one hundred and five exercises, but in studying these carefully, one feels that they lose much by not being carefully arranged. For instance, he gives three exercises to develop the *Co-ordination of Mind, Voice, and Body*, the first one of which is Exercise 6; the second, Exercise 11; and the third Exercise 13, when there is no especial reason for their not being consecutive. Also on page 125, Exercise 38, is for "Agility of the Soft Palate," and on page 159, Exercise 54, we come to practically the same thing under the name of "Flexibility of the Soft Palate," These are but a few of many such instances.

The work of Chapter I is no doubt very valuable, but Chapter II belongs wholly to the province of vocal expression. The exercises are for "Intensity of Impression," "Individualization of Impression," "Impression and Vocal Responses," "Co-ordination of Mind, Body, and Voice," "Lyric Impression and Exaltation." (Exercises 7-13 inclusive.) The real work in preparation for tone does not begin until Chapter III. Many of the terms he uses, such as "Freedom of Nasal Vibration," (p. 157) "Transcendence of Conditions over Modulations," (p. 199) "Recoil from Voice to Life Breathing," (p. 104) seem vague and highly technical, and would be more forcible if expressed in a simpler way.

The great value of Dr. Curry's book lies in his unceasing emphasis upon the relation of mind and voice, and his work upon the modulations of the voice. While his chapters on preparation for and initiation of tone are very helpful, Dr. Mills and Dr. Aikin make this field much clearer.

English Diction—Part I—The Voice in Speech is written by Miss Clara Kathleen Rogers, a teacher of singing in Boston. Miss Rogers offers a practical system for the improvement of defective voices, and the attainment of perfect diction in speech and song. She does not urge "the study of elocution, as an extra accomplishment . . . , but good, plain speaking for everyday to be taught to all alike whether they want it or not." A worthy purpose, no doubt, and one to be commended, but in her handling of the subject, the author shows a lack of scientific knowledge that makes her book of very little use.

Two fundamental laws upon which she lays especial stress are: "Never anticipate voice by first forming vowels in the mouth. Use only the air in the mouth, and none from the lungs in articulating consonants" (p. 50).

The first law is the result of complete misunderstanding of the action of the larynx. She claims that the "inadequacy" of the American voice "is the result of *forming vowels in the mouth* in anticipation of any vibratory action of the vocal cords" (p. 50). She wishes to make a distinction between the formation¹ of a firm, strong fundamental tone, which is the result of the action of the breath against firmly closed cords,—and the soft, breathy tone which occurs when the vocal cords are not approximated closely and breath is allowed to escape, but her lack of definite knowledge of the action of the larynx has led her to the conclusion that the latter action is accompanied by no vibration of the vocal cords.

The second law is evidently the result of her efforts to simplify the art of breathing. This law, as stated, may be clear to her, but could not fail to prove disastrous to any ambitious teacher who tried to use it.

Her proposed plan of improving speech is wholly by means of articulatory gymnastics, most of which would only increase the interference which Dr. Muckey holds is the cause of so many voice troubles. The whole book is another evidence of the need of real scientific training for teachers of singing or speech.

¹See Aikin, "The Voice," pp. 93 and 94.

Voice and Nerve Control is by Jutta Belle-Ranske, a teacher of singing in New York City. We have every right to expect a great deal from this book, for the author insists emphatically upon the need of every voice teacher having thorough scientific knowledge, yet her own misconception of scientific facts is astounding. The worth of the book may be readily appreciated when we learn that she places especial emphasis upon (1) The development of "Medulla Breathing, which, through the nervous system, governs the whole body," (p. 10) and (2) "The remarkable conclusion that song can be produced equally well both during inhalation and exhalation" (p. 129).

In establishing the first law she has attempted to explain the formation of the habit of voluntary breathing, but her lack of knowledge regarding the difference in function between the Central Nervous System and the Automatic or Sympathetic Nervous System has led to some very ludicrous conclusions. In his *Text-book of Physiology*, page 24, Dr. Wm. H. Howell says of the medulla: "the *unconscious* and *involuntary* regulation of the organs of circulation and respiration, and to a certain extent of the other visceral organs, has been centralized, as it were, in the medulla."

It is necessary even to quote such authorities as Drs. Mills and Aikin who hold that voice is the result of the expiration of the breath, to show the falseness of the second statement quoted above.

Altogether the book is a strange mixture of a little fact and a great deal of fancy, and is an excellent example of the danger to which the author calls our attention on page 15,—"*a little knowledge will always prove a very dangerous thing.*"

In connection with the last two books under discussion the following statement by Dr. Aikin seems quite appropriate:¹ "I do not wish to go so far as to advise musicians not to write books about the voice. They are at liberty to say all they know of its final performances. But it is only fair to let them know that deductions from a superficial knowledge of science much more often mislead than enlighten, and that while their consideration of anatomy, etc., may impress the uninitiated, their pseudo-scientific conclusions have the reverse effect upon those who are qualified to criticise them. . . . And yet, if they would only relate as clearly as possible their positive experiences and observations, without omitting any detail, musicians might indicate to phonological science a great many new points for thorough investigation."

¹"The Voice," p. 146.

An analysis of the above books shows that there is a sharp division among the writers on voice training, one class dealing with the anatomy and physiology of tone production, another with the mental side as expressed in modulations of the voice. A well-balanced course in voice training should cover both phases of the subject. With this object in view the following tentative program of voice training, outlining a plan of procedure, which is in no sense final, has been arranged.

I. The Mechanics of Tone Production.

A—The Mechanical Conditions for Tone.

- a. Anatomy and physiology of breathing.
- b. Types of breathing.
- c. Tests of breathing.
- d. Exercises for strengthening the diaphragm.

B—Tone Production.

- a. Anatomy and physiology of larynx and resonating chambers.
- b. Exercises for production of tone, keeping all conditions outlined in the first step, and with special emphasis upon resonance.

II. Modulations of the Voice.

A—Change of Pitch.

B—Inflections.

- a. Study of meaning and value of these modulations.
- b. Exercises and problems for their development.

C—Quality.

- a. Study of its meaning and value, special emphasis on resonance.
- b. Exercises and problems to accentuate relation of voice, body, and mind.

One of the great problems of voice training lies in the transition from Part I to Part II. While Part I has to do more particularly with the science of tone, Part II has the greater problem of modulating the properly made tone by thought and feeling. Right here we come to the question as to what degree vocal expression shall be a part of voice training. Today cultivation of the speaking voice is a luxury for the very few who have had special work in vocal expression or public speaking, so voice training seems to be intimately connected with these subjects. A great change is taking place however. Teachers, professional men, and business men are beginning to realize the value of voice and speech training,

and the time is fast coming when practical voice courses must be arranged for people who are not students of vocal expression or public speaking. The books here discussed have been examined particularly as to how they meet the requirements of the suggested program. It is significant that the scientists give thorough and adequate work for Part I, while the teachers of vocal expression are the only ones who outline the work covered in Part II. As yet there is no one book which combines both phases of the question and meets the changing demands of voice training. Perhaps this is but natural since the first type of book is the product of the scientist, and the second of the artist. However, there is need of a book which handles both sides of the subject, and which makes the training of the modulations of the voice practicable for the general student of voice.

ARTISTIC INTERPRETATION*

PAUL M. PEARSON
Swarthmore College

IN CONSIDERING this subject we will do well to determine first of all what common ground there is. It is not too much to assume that the artist has some message which he is convinced should be presented. This will eliminate those persons who are drawn to the platform by vanity. We have all listened to those whose only motive appeared to be an itching to be heard, or seen. This includes not only young people whose vanity might well be excused, but older persons who seek to win personal recognition.

With this large and conspicuous class we are not now concerned. We give our attention only to those who are possessed of a passion to present some message from the printed page, who wish to give a vocal interpretation to the words which but for the quickening power of speech must remain less effective to most persons.

I take it as unnecessary to maintain with this audience that the interpreter's art is creative art. Emerson says "There is a creative reading as well as a creative writing." The French speak of "creating a part" in a drama, a phrase we have borrowed in this country. It is an apt phrase, accurately characterizing the work done by the actor who first takes the part in a new play.

For this group of speakers let us consider: 1. what standard they must recognize, and 2. what elements must be dealt with in measuring up to their standards.

One standard by which an interpreter's work must be judged is *sincerity*. This is perhaps the most essential measure of any art form. I quote from Bliss Carmen's refreshing book, *The Poetry of Life*.

"Insincerity, which is not always one of the greatest sins in the moral universe, becomes in the world of art an offence of the first magnitude. Insincerity in life may be mean and despicable, and indicate a petty nature; but in art insincerity is death. A strong man may lie upon occasion, and make restitution and be forgiven, but for the artist who lies there is hardly any reparation

* From a paper read at the Eastern Conference, Princeton, N. J., April, 1916.

possible, and his forgiveness is much more difficult. Art, being the embodiment of the artist's ideal, is truly the corporeal substance of his spiritual self; and that there should be any falsehood in it, any deliberate failure to represent him faithfully, is as monstrous and unnatural as it would be for a man to disavow his own flesh and bones. Here we are, every one of us going through life committed and attached to our bodies; for all that we do we are held responsible; if we misbehave, the world will take it out of our hide. But here is our friend the artist committing his spiritual energy to his art, to an embodiment outside himself, and escaping down a by-path from all the consequences. What shall be said of him? The insincere artist is as much beyond the pale of human sympathy as the murderer. There is no excuse for him, either. There was no call for him to make a liar of himself, other than the most sordid of reasons,—the little gain, the jingling reward of gold. For no man would ever be insincere in his art, except for pay, except to cater to some other taste than his own."

With this we must recognize another world—old standard,—*beauty*. No man can understand life who does not recognize the human travail toward the beautiful. Color and form and harmony are about us everywhere. The artist who does not try to realize it in his work, who does not recognize how the beautiful "out-reaches and overcomes all ugliness" both handicaps himself and falls below the possible measure of artistic endeavor.

The third standard I shall name is *elation*. An ancient critic says "the poetry of life is the poetry of beauty, sincerity, and elation." All art must bring zest, strength, fortitude, and cheer. That which brings depression, sorrow, defeat, and death is so untrue to the impulses of mankind as to be unworthy and ignoble.

These are the standards by which we measure any art. The artist himself does not formulate them, but he unconsciously feels his way toward them.

The elements in artistic interpretation are three: *The subject matter to be chosen*. Though it is difficult to determine what lends itself to interpretation, we will all agree, no doubt, that however excellent the matter may be, judged by literary standards, not all literature is possible for vocal interpretation. The closet drama and the acting drama are not more unlike than literature which may and may not be chosen for interpretation. I shall attempt no discussion of the question involved, but only express

the conviction, born of observation and experience, that most interpreters underestimate the vocal possibilities of many literary masterpieces and confine themselves to selections which cannot pass in literary company, and which are below the best appreciation of their audiences.

The second element is *the manner of presentation*. Here we have an even wider range of choice than in the subject matter. We observe two extremes. One interpreter depends entirely upon his skill. His attention is given to his diction, his gesture, and his tone. The perfection of these three is his conception of adequate interpretation. He has little regard for the author's nicer shades of meaning, for climaxes, for the vital message of the selection. His passion is for the beauty of tone, the grace of gesture, the exactness of diction. Interpretation with him is the sensuous beauty of the rendition. Such schools we find in painting, in poetry, and in other art forms.

The other extreme is the interpreter who gives little or no heed to diction, tone and action. His passion is for the thought. He recites a lyric much as though it were a bit of narration. He stands as rigidly in one as in the other and there is little or no change in manner as he turns from one form of literature to another. He does give us the thought, but not the thought "touched with emotion," and "drenched in beauty."

As my last sentence implies, I would have our interpreter give us the thought suffused with feeling. This can be done only through skill in the use of voice and action. If the interpreter is to give us only the thought we had best spend our time in reading. That is much more economical, and much more comfortable. If he is to give us only the beautiful tone, diction and gesture, we had best spend our time at chamber concerts or the opera, where the art form admits of much more development of the qualities named.

The third element presents the widest differences both in theory and in practice. Here we find strongly intrenched the interpreter who stands for "art for art's sake," and the interpreter who scoffs at such pretension. This element is *the audience*.

What shall be the attitude of the interpreter toward his audience? It was Sir Walter Scott who said "the sea of upturned faces which makes half the speech." While Sir Walter doubtless referred to that form of speech which is generally designated as oratory,

his observation is only less true of that form which we call interpretation.

If we grant that there can be perfect appreciation when one reads aloud to himself, yet the work of the interpreter requires that he have an audience. We may not unreasonably expect that his success or failure depends on his arousing some degree of enthusiasm with his audience for the selection he attempts to interpret.

I know that those who set their standard as "art for art's sake," will not concede my contention. They insist that it is not their business to supply brains for the audience; that it is the misfortune of the audience if it fails to appreciate the literary menu offered. If the audience lacks taste, the audience is to be pitied, but nothing can be done for them.

There is a fundamental difference between the interpreter and the poet, the painter, the sculptor, and many others. The poet may transcribe his emotion and wait for those who will enjoy it. If he has an audience in mind at all, it is an audience of his own choosing. It may consist of a kindred soul in Princeton, another in Cambridge, and others scattered over the earth. The audience that likes the poem will find it. Time and place are no elements in the consideration. Or he may write for generations yet to be educated.

The interpreter must work under the limitations of time and place. His audience is before him. They are dependent upon him. It is not of his choosing. For the moment at least he is the medium through which they are to understand and enjoy what he presents. The interpreter's business is to get, hold, and develop enthusiasm in his audience. He cannot turn away to another audience. His moral obligation is to realize from the material before him the possibilities of a combination of the poem, the hearer, and the interpreter. It is a difficult task at times. It often deals with uncertain, and not infrequently with at least one unpromising element. There are many interpreters who do not know how to combine the elements at hand. Given a lemon, sugar, and water, it does not occur to everybody to make lemonade. Water is pure water, the earth's universal beverage; a lemon is a lemon; sugar is sugar; why combine them? He who cannot bring the audience, the poem, and the interpreter together, is likely to denounce his audience, and to take refuge in "art for art's sake."

I would not be misunderstood as saying that it is always the fault of the interpreter when the audience does not get enthusiastic over his program. It may be the fault of the audience; it often is. It may be the fault of the program; that is often the case. I sincerely believe, however, that it is oftener the fault of the interpreter. His task is even more difficult than that of the orator. His art form has more limitations. He works under as rigid limitations as the writer of a sonnet; but that is no excuse for blaming the audience when he fails.

The interpreter must know crowd psychology as perfectly as the orator. Most failures in interpretation arise from lack of this knowledge, or lack of skill in applying it. The interpreter trains himself in tone, diction, and action. In this training he is painstaking and persistent. He acquires technical skill such as few orators possess. He works laboriously on his interpretation until he has mastered it—for himself. But this interpretation is for himself only—or at most for a little group who know his selections, or many like it. Then he fares forth to interpret it to others. He begins with them where he has left off in his study, and is perplexed, disgusted, and discouraged because the audience does not understand, or does not get enthusiastic. Then he complains of the audience, and charges them with lack of appreciation. He tries again. If he fails again, he is likely to take refuge in "art for art's sake."

What is his difficulty? Why does he fail? I have no panacea. But there are several things to be considered, all of which must enter into the case.

For any lack of success he blames the audience. This state of mind prevents his finding out what the difficulty may be. His first obligation is to examine himself, his attitude toward his theme, his attitude toward his audience, and to examine his method.

A second important reason for his lack of success is that he has approached his interpretation from his level of experience and appreciation, rather than that of his audience, which is probably on a lower level. He has overlooked the important fact that an interpreter must be a teacher. He must take people where they are and lead them in the direction he thinks they should go.

A third reason for his lack of success, is his ignorance of, or his disregard of, crowd psychology. It has not occurred to him to place tests in the first few minutes of his program which will deter-

mine the artistic limits of his hearers, which will thus enable him to decide what his method of treatment will be for that particular audience.

There is a dread superstition which terrorizes many a young interpreter, and which has withered the powers of many an older man—"Is it art?" We are afraid to be thought inartistic—afraid to be ourselves, to make our training fit us, afraid to throw ourselves into the interpretation, but stand off admonishing ourselves to be artistic. Kipling's "The Conundrum of the Workshop" is the happiest characterization of this world-old dread.

"When the flush of a new-born sun fell first on Eden's green and gold,
Our father Adam sat under the Tree and scratched with a stick in the mould;
And the first rude sketch that the world had seen was joy to his mighty heart,
Till the Devil whispered behind the leaves, 'It's pretty, but is it Art?'

Wherefore he called to his wife, and fled to fashion his work anew—
The first of his race who cared a fig for the first, most dread review;
And he left his lore to the use of his sons—and that was a glorious gain
When the Devil chuckled 'Is it Art?' in the ear of the branded Cain.

They builded a tower to shiver the sky and wrench the stars apart,
Till the Devil grunted behind the bricks: 'It's striking, but is it Art?'
The stone was dropped at the quarry-side and the idle derrick swung,
While each man talked of the aims of Art, and each in an alien tongue."

The last important reason I shall name is his fear of cheapening his art for the sake of applause. Any conscientious artist may well be alarmed by the temptation to win applause. The observation of all of us, doubtless, is that a majority of reciters seem willing to do anything to get a laugh or a hand-clap. To crow or to bark, to dance, to make grimaces, to wrest words or phrases from their meaning are the devices we all see commonly employed for starting noisy demonstrations from the audience. Witnessing such performances fills a sincere man with disgust, and brings an artist to a determination not to be what is commonly called popular.

But I insist that the methods of the charlatan are not necessary to win the approval of an audience. Because a vast number of reciters underestimate the appreciation and discrimination of audiences, because they mistake a noisy applause for approval, because they have not sufficient faith in their art to rely on its legitimate forms, does not release interpreters from the obligation of interesting their audiences.

To summarize, let me point out that interpretation requires that the artist be sincere, that he present the beautiful, and that

he produce in his hearers a degree of elation. In addition he must have such skill as to win his audience to an approval of the message he presents. If he be insincere, he is a moral felon. If he fail to present his message suffused with beauty and touched with emotion he may be striving for, but he does not attain artistic interpretation. If he fail to win his audience, he is not with that audience an interpreter. There can be no interpretation without the collaboration of the audience, and that collaboration it is the business of the artist to secure.

EDITORIAL

THE SECOND ANNUAL CONVENTION

AT OUR last annual meeting the question of where we should hold our next conference was left to the executive committee with power. At that time the English Council had not determined where it would meet this year.

Later the English Council decided to meet in New York at the Hotel Astor. Our executive committee carried on a discussion of the matter as well as was possible by mail; and the decision was finally made that we should meet in New York, at the Hotel Astor, on the Friday and Saturday following Thanksgiving,—that is, I believe, on December 1 and 2.

The principal reasons for this decision were, that we wished to work in harmony with the English Council, and we learned from the leaders of the Council that they would be pleased to have us meet at the same time and place; that we wished to better introduce our association to Eastern people, some of whom have insisted upon considering us a Middle West organization, in spite of the fact that we have had many Eastern members from the start; and a very important reason for the decision was the offer of the Eastern Conference to change its meeting time from April to November and hold a joint meeting with us. We regret that a meeting in New York is not convenient for some of our most earnest members: but we hope they will make a special effort to attend, and believe they will be repaid by extending their acquaintance with the teachers of the East.

It remains now to work for another successful conference. In this I may have the loyal support of our members. This is the critical year with our organization, the year which will determine whether the success of last year was due solely to the energy and ability of our officers, or whether the teachers of public speaking are capable of enough *esprit de corps* to make the success enduring.

We need the Association and the *Quarterly*. We need them because they give us new dignity in the academic world, and thus

directly help us to gain a better position; we need them because they give us new ideas, stimulate us to think, get us out of our ruts, give us new courage, and thus tend to raise our standards and fit us to fill that better position. No teacher who attended the conference last year can be indifferent to the success of the organization. One wrote, "You who have had your conventions before do not know what the one last year meant to a teacher who had never had the opportunity to be a part of any such meeting." The splendid progress now being made in our work would, if our organization and its organ should fail, be set back ten years.

They will not fail; but there is need for earnest labor on the part of each member. What is to be done? Gain new members, and new subscribers for the *Quarterly*; and make your plans to attend the meeting in New York. In writing other teachers, talk of the Association, the *Quarterly* and the meeting. Such personal work will win more than any number of circulars.

Another special request I wish to make: Help in the preparation of another good program. Write me of any subjects you wish to hear discussed, and of any teacher you know to have made a special study or evolved a promising method which would furnish the substance of a valuable paper.

Will you "do your bit"?

J. A. WINANS.

WANTED: AN ACCURATE LABEL

THERE is hardly a book written or reviewed or a reference made to any of our work but demands a special explanation as to what is meant or what is not meant by the term "public speaking." The great majority of our departments in the United States are today called *Departments of Public Speaking*. There are a few *Departments of Oratory*, a few of *Expression*, one of *Oral English*, one of *Speech*, and one or two of *Elocution*. Suggestions have been made that the big university departments ought to be called *Departments of Speech Science*, or *Speech Science and Arts*.

It must be perfectly plain to anyone who had to deal with professional matters among widely scattered universities, and to a certain extent to each student or teacher in this field, that misunderstandings, confusion, and sometimes embarrassment results from this babble of titles. It seems to us that this question of department names ought to be seriously considered in the immediate future, and something like uniformity hit upon. While, of course, it

is impossible for the National Association or any other body to legislate titles onto the departments of the country, if someone could devise a label that would accurately cover our field, and not a small section of it only, we believe such a label would be adopted by so many of the leading institutions all over the country that its use would, within a decade, be universal.

This would be an excellent topic for discussion at the Annual Conference in New York in the fall, if not as a regular part of the program, at least in the lobbies and corridors in an informal way. In order to help out the general situation, the *Quarterly* invites a competition for the October number, and solicits entries in a department-naming contest. If you wish to help clear up this confusion, and gain immortality by being the first to suggest the title which is going to be universally used within the next few years, send your choice of title and your reasons for thinking it superior to others, in a document not to exceed 300 words. A title already in use will, of course, do just as well, if you can show that it is the only right one, as a brand new title. Send in your choice at your early convenience. Entries will be numbered as received, in order to give proper time rank to those who submit the same title.

DISCUSSION IN THE *QUARTERLY*

WE ARE glad that a number of readers of the *Quarterly* have expressed their pleasure at the discussions which have been going forward from time to time in the pages of the *Quarterly*. It may be worth while once a year to remind our readers that the columns of the *Quarterly* are open for discussions of any and all topics relating to any of the branches of speech science or art, and that opinions for the *Quarterly* are not censored. If any reader wishes to start a discussion or take part in a discussion already under way, the editors will be very glad to receive such a contribution. While we cannot, of course, guarantee to publish everything that is submitted, we can guarantee that exclusion will not be made because members of the staff disagree with the opinions expressed. Further, if the readers of the *Quarterly* have definite questions they would like to have answered in the pages of the *Quarterly*, we shall be glad to receive such questions, and send them out to members of the profession who are qualified to answer them, and later to publish the answers. We wish in every way possible to make the *Quarterly* a clearing house for ideas and information in all corners of the field of speech study, public or private.

THE FORUM

CRITICISM VS. CENSURE

THE word Criticism is derived from the Aryan root "skar," meaning to separate, to discern, to sift and hence to analyze. Crabb in his "English Synonyms" says: "Criticism consists in minutely examining the intrinsic characteristics and appreciating each individually and the whole collectively. It refers to matters of science and learning. It takes nothing for granted. It analyzes and decomposes. It asserts and supports its assertion." The celebrated English critic Warton writes: "Just criticism demands not only that every beauty and blemish be pointed out in its different degree and kind, but also that the reason and foundation of excellencies and faults be accurately ascertained."

Those who are in a position to know, tell us in no uncertain terms that criticism consists in a statement of faults and excellencies supported by good and sufficient reasons. It must be true, therefore, that real criticism is one of the most fortunate and helpful things which can happen to any one. If one has wrong conceptions and is therefore acting irrationally, or, in other words, if one is following a road which is leading him away from the desired goal, he certainly must be grateful to another who points out to him the direction he should take. It is for the above reasons that the present writer welcomes criticism.

A certain review by Professor Guy B. Muchmore which purports to be a criticism of the "Natural Method of Voice Production" and which appeared in the April number of the *Quarterly*, does not seem to fulfill the requirements of "just criticism."

Professor Muchmore states that the writer has appropriated fundamental facts from the writings of other investigators without giving due credit. There is in the Public Library of New York City, and doubtless in other libraries, a reprint of some articles written by Professor Hallock and the author of the "Natural Method" which appeared in the *Looker-On* magazine during the summer of 1896. These articles contained practically all of the

fundamental facts used by the author of the "Natural Method" and therefore antedate all the books quoted by Professor Muchmore, with the exception of *Voice, Song and Speech*, by Browne and Behnke, published in 1883. The writer certainly cannot be accused of appropriating the ideas of Browne and Behnke as many of these are opposed to the fundamental facts of anatomy, physiology, and physics. If any appropriating has been done it must have been done by the authors quoted. The very nature of a fundamental fact is such that it is extremely difficult, if not impossible, to ascribe its discovery to any particular individual. For example, if any one should claim to have discovered the fundamental fact "the voice is sound," he would be laughed at, for this is a matter of common experience of which every one has knowledge. When the author states that "they had full knowledge of the fundamental facts bearing on voice production," he simply means they possessed this knowledge in common with all anatomists, physiologists and physicists. In any case the discovery of fundamental facts was not the problem under consideration, as the author distinctly states on page 8 of the Preface "their problem consisted in the application of these facts to the voice mechanism itself.

Professor Muchmore states: "nevertheless opinion may vary as to the qualities of a 'free vocal tone.'" An opinion, no matter by whom expressed, is valueless unless it can be based directly upon some fundamental fact or perception. No mention has been made by the author of "the qualities of a free vocal tone." Tone quality depends upon the number and relative intensities of the partial tones. Will Professor Muchmore state just what combination of partial tones is required to produce the "free vocal tone"? Also how and why would he change the definition of correct voice production as given in the book? Further, will Professor Muchmore state the composition of the so-called "nasal tone or twang" and describe that action of the voice mechanism which produces it? It has been demonstrated beyond the possibility of dispute that a tone may be produced, all of which comes through the nose, which has not a trace of the so-called "nasal quality or twang."

"Nasal quality" then must be due to some other cause. Will Professor Muchmore state what in his opinion is the cause of "nasal quality"? Will Professor Muchmore explain what Dr. Aiken means when he says "the passage through the nose during M must be carefully watched when opening onto a vowel"? How can the

nasal passage be "watched" and how can it "open onto a vowel"? Careful observations with the laryngoscope have demonstrated that when a "nasal tone" is being produced the false vocal cords are slightly approximated so that they interfere with the swing of the vocal cords as a whole, thus reducing the intensity of the fundamental tone. Our voice analyses show invariably the presence of a weak fundamental in the so-called "nasal tone."

Professor Muchmore misquotes when he attributes the use of the term "hardness" to the author. "Harshness" is the term used and its meaning is quite different. Will Professor Muchmore state "the ideas so long accepted" which have been put forth as the cause of roughness and harshness in the tone? The author explains very fully on pages 70-73 the influence of the muscular fibers surrounding the ventricle, which includes the false cords, upon the pitch mechanism. He concludes this discussion by the statement that "the pulling in of these soft parts makes the cords heavier. False cord interference is a fruitful source of faulty intonation." If the difficulty were due to a "poor ear," there would be no "sliding up to pitch." If the singer began on the wrong pitch he would continue to sustain this pitch. Will Professor Muchmore explain how the "cords themselves can respond to the dictates of the ear"? It may be easily understood that muscular tissue may respond to sense impression. The response of yellow elastic tissue, of which the vocal cords are composed, is quite a different proposition. Any evidence to support the contention that yellow elastic tissue will respond to sense impression will be welcomed by all physiologists.

Professor Muchmore objects to the author's statement that the voice mechanism is a stringed instrument because the vocal cords "are attached not only at either end but also along one entire side." Helmholtz in his "Sensations of Tone," in speaking of the action of a membrane, states on page 146-B: "if the tension in direction of its length is infinitesimally small in comparison with the tension in direction of the breadth, then the radial fibers of the membrane may be approximately regarded as forming a system of stretched strings." This is precisely the condition of the vocal cords during voice production. On pages 54 and 55 the author gives ample reasons why the voice mechanism must be considered as a stringed instrument. Will Professor Muchmore present the reasons of Dr. Mills or any evidence of his own, to prove that the voice mechanism should not be classed as a stringed instrument?

Professor Muchmore states: "it is only with a sufficient quantity of air in the lungs and a well regulated pressure against the vocal cords that we are enabled to meet the demands of good speech and song." Professor Muchmore will doubtless admit that "the demands of good speech and song" are satisfied by an adequate range of pitch and the production of any desired volume and quality. Does he not also admit that pitch depends upon length, weight and tension of the vocal cords, that volume depends upon the extent of swing of the cords and upon resonance, and that quality depends upon the swing of the cords as a whole and in segments and upon resonance? The only things, therefore, which directly affect pitch, volume and quality are the vocal cords or vibrator, the pitch mechanism and the resonance mechanism. Breath can only affect the tone through its action upon the vocal cords and this in only one way, namely, by determining the extent of vibration of the cord. The fact that breath can only affect the voice through the vocal cords makes it a secondary cause. The following list of causes might be continued indefinitely: The vibration of the vocal cords is directly responsible for the origination of the voice; breath pressure is directly responsible for the vibration of the vocal cords; elasticity of the chest walls and lung substance is directly responsible for the breath pressure, etc., etc.

Will Professor Muchmore give Dr. Aiken's reasons for his statement that "pressure of the breath is directly responsible for the sound of the voice"? The writer maintains that the breathing muscles are sufficiently trained by means of ordinary exercise to regulate breath pressure and that no special breathing exercises are necessary. The author's experience has proven this and it applies with equal force to the college student as well as to the ordinary voice student.

Sufficient reasons have been given in the book in regard to the use of the exercises for voice development. Professor Muchmore has given no reasons why this order should be changed. Will Professor Muchmore state the facts upon which "the generally accepted theory that all training should begin with the broad vowel *ah*" is based?

Professor Muchmore's position that the book is for the "professional" and not for the "untrained teacher" is untenable because any one who understands the English language and who possesses a good English dictionary may grasp the ideas set forth in the book. Will Professor Muchmore tell us what is an "untrained teacher"?

Professor Muchmore says, "in spite of all that may be pointed out against it, the book contains many valuable discussions and a number of good illustrations." Thus far Professor Muchmore has not pointed out one error and substantiated it by facts or reasons. His criticism is not "just criticism," but mere censure. In his discussion of the meanings of the words *criticism* and *censure*, Crabb says, "censure requires no more than simple assertion. Its justice or propriety often rests upon the authority of the individual. The office of the censorer is the easier and less honorable of the two. It may be assumed by ignorance and impertinence. The office of the critic is both arduous and honorable. It cannot be filled by any one incompetent for the charge without exposing his arrogance and folly to merited contempt." If Professor Muchmore can present "just criticism" of this work it will be gratefully received. No further attention can be paid to mere censure.

FLOYD S. MUCKEY.

NEW YORK CITY, June 12, 1916.

THE NEW ENGLAND PUBLIC SPEAKING CONFERENCE

THE New England Public Speaking Conference held its annual meeting at Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass., Friday and Saturday, April 7 and 8. Friday evening was given to Oral English. Mr. John M. Brewer, of the Department of Education, Harvard, gave a very interesting account of oral English teaching in a high school in Los Angeles, California, where he was formerly a teacher of the subject. Mr. A. B. DeMille, of Milton Academy, led in a discussion of this subject and was followed by many others. The point was emphasized that the problem of teaching this subject in the schools would be much simplified if the colleges gave some definite recognition to it either in admitting students or in making requirements for their degrees.

Saturday was taken up with the subjects of Voice Training and of Debating. Mrs. Clara Kathleen Rogers, of Boston, read a most convincing paper on The Voice in Speech and Its Significance as a Revelation of Character. This was discussed by Mr. William Alden Paul, of the Episcopal Theological Seminary, Cambridge, and by others. A strong paper on holding inter-collegiate debating to high ethical standards was presented by Professor William Hawley Davis, of Bowdoin College. Mr. P. C. Cook of Dartmouth,

and Mr. C. H. Colleston, of the Institute of Technology, Boston, took leading parts in the discussion.

The officers of the past year were re-elected as follows: President, Professor John Corsa, Amherst College; Vice-Presidents, Professor A. T. Robinson, Technology, Principal D. O. S. Lowell, Roxbury Latin School; Secretary, Professor H. B. Huntington, Brown University; Treasurer, Professor W. H. Davis, Bowdoin College.

THE EASTERN PUBLIC SPEAKING CONFERENCE

THE Eastern Public Speaking Conference held its annual meeting at Princeton Seminary, Princeton, New Jersey, on April 24 and 25, 1916. The meeting was characterized by lively discussions from start to finish. Delegates were present from twenty-five different institutions in the States of New Hampshire, Massachusetts, Connecticut, New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Maryland, West Virginia, and Illinois.

The program included sixteen addresses¹ under the general divisions of Voice Training, Interpretation of the Printed Page, The Oration, The Occasional Address, Argumentation and Debate, The Drama, and The Psychology of Public Speaking. By unavoidable circumstances, Professors Winter of Harvard and Maxcy of Williams were unable to be present to read their respective papers on "Theories and Methods in Training the Voice," and "Practical Aspects of Brief Drawing." Professor Maxcy's paper, however, was read by Professor Moses of Westminster College and was well received.

Following the opening remarks of President Kay, Dr. F. S. Muckey, the voice specialist from New York City, addressed the Conference on "Some Fundamental Facts and Their Application to Voice Production." Dr. Muckey's discussion of secondary interference and relaxation was highly enlightening. One of Dr. Muckey's pupils won great applause from the Conference by his wonderful vocal resonance, acquired under Dr. Muckey's instruction.

Professor Pearson of Swarthmore gave an entertaining and chatty talk in his inimitable style on "Artistic Standards of Interpretation." He was followed by Dr. S. S. Curry of Boston, who

¹ A number of these appeared in the April 1916 number of the *Quarterly*. Others are in this issue.—Ed.

spoke on "Mental Actions and Voice Modulations in Bible Reading." Dr. Curry read beautifully portions of Scripture and commented, as he read, upon the necessity for knowing all that a passage connotes, and for being able to make the proper vocal adjustments.

Professor Wetzel of Yale spoke on the subject, "Composition and Delivery of the Oration"; Professor Tilroe of Syracuse, on "The Spirit of the Oration"; and Professor Carmody of the Union Theological Seminary, on "Personality in the Oration." Professor Wetzel took the ground that in modern practice too little attention is being paid to preparation and delivery, and too much value is being attached to so-called natural expression; Professor Tilroe issued a call for *men* as public speakers, and emphasized the impossibility of expecting oratory from mere boys; Professor Carmody concluded this division of the program by maintaining that a cold man could never be an orator."

In an address on "The Organization of Speech Material," Professor Robinson of The College of the City of New York contended that a topic outline logically arranged and intended as the basis for an extempore speech was the proper method of preparation for public speaking. This paper brought out a lively discussion. Professor J. C. French of Johns Hopkins read a paper on the subject, "Class Room Use of the Occasional Speech," in which he expressed the opinion that training in this form of public address was more practical than any other. Owing to the absence of Professor Maxcy, Professor Shaw was the only representative of debating to speak before the Conference. His paper was on the subject, "Systematic Analysis of Debaters' Problems."

Under the division of the Drama, Professor Blanks of Colgate spoke on "Conducting a Dramatic Club in the Department of Public Speaking," and Professor Stuart of Princeton spoke on "The Psychology of the Theatrical Audience." Both papers brought out considerable discussion. Professor Blanks sees great advantages in having college dramatics under faculty supervision, but he regards the problem of transition from student control as very delicate. Professor Stuart recommends that plays be written, not for the critics, but for the theatre-going public, because the psychology of the audience is not intellectual, but emotional; it is not the psychology of the schools, but the psychology of the mob.

Under the general subject, "The Psychology of Public Speaking," three excellent papers were presented. Professor McKean of Union spoke on "The Public Speaker a Word Artist"; Professor Lane of Pittsburgh on "The Psychology of Action"; and Professor Covington of Princeton on "Imaginative Suggestion". It is fortunate indeed that these papers have been made available to the readers of the *Quarterly* by publication in the April number. The papers of McKean and Covington will appear later in the year as chapters in text books now in press.

At the business meeting of the Conference, it was voted that the chair appoint a committee to investigate and report on the advisability of attempting to establish a minimum standard course in Public Speaking for colleges. The chair took under advisement the appointment of the committee, and the announcement of the membership will be made later. It was also voted to extend to Professor Fulton of Ohio Wesleyan the sympathy and best wishes of the Conference. Professors Kay and Shaw were re-elected president and secretary-treasurer, respectively, for the ensuing year. Professors Smith of Princeton, Blanks of Colgate, and Moses of Westminster, together with Professors Kay and Shaw, were appointed a committee with power to determine the time and place of the next meeting.

Those present at the Conference were: Professors Adams of Lebanon Valley, Blanks of Colgate, Cain of Washington, Carmody of Union Theological, Covington of Princeton, Curry of the School of Expression, Dennis of Northwestern, French of Johns Hopkins, Kay of Washington and Jefferson, Lane of Pittsburgh, Luch of Lehigh, McKean of Union, Moses of Westminster, Muckey of New York City, Neil of West Virginia, Palmer of the College of the City of New York, Pearson of Swarthmore, Robinson of the College of the City of New York, Shaw of Dartmouth, Smith of Bucknell, Smith of Princeton Seminary, Smith of Colgate, Strong of Princeton, Stuart of Princeton, Tilroe of Syracuse, Van Dahlen of Wells, Wetzel of Yale, and Winans of Cornell. After the conference adjourned the members joined a crowd of Princeton citizens and listened to several short addresses. Among the speakers were President Wilson and Governor Fielder.

A SUMMER CONFERENCE

THE New England Public Speaking Conference voted, at its recent annual meeting, to extend to all teachers of public speaking or of oral English an invitation to attend a special Summer Conference, to be held at Harvard University, under the auspices of the New England Conference, in connection with the Harvard Summer School. The Conference will be held on three successive afternoons and will consider subjects of wide general interest as well as others of special scientific character. Professor I. L. Winter, Harvard University, Chairman of the Committee of arrangements, invites any who are interested in this Conference, from any part of the country, to communicate with him at once for advising as to the best time, between July 10 and August 18, for holding the meetings. Eight universities and colleges, Eastern and Western, will be represented in the corps of instructors in the Harvard Summer courses in public speaking. In view of this gathering of high ranking teachers, and because of the several meetings of teachers' associations in the East, the time seems opportune for this special Conference. The exact dates will be announced later.

IN OTHER JOURNALS

THE recent increase in professional writing in our field makes it seem advisable for the *Quarterly* to add to its regular service in regard to new books a brief comment on professional periodical literature. The editorial staff requests the coöperation of the readers of the *Quarterly* in making this quarterly summary of periodical publications in our field as complete and helpful as possible. If in your reading you run across articles that seem to have professional significance, please either forward a brief report of them to the editor, or send to any member of the staff an accurate reference to such articles in order that they may be reported for the benefit of the whole profession.

THE MANAGEMENT OF THE SPEECH DEFECT PROBLEM IN THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS. By WALTER B. SWIFT, M.D., *Journal of Educational Administration and Supervision*, March, 1916, p. 150. This article was read by Doctor Swift before the American Association of the Advancement of Science, at Berkeley, Calif., August 3, 1915. The article concerns itself, not with the treatment of speech defects, but

confines itself rather closely to the management of the problem by the public schools. The author points out that many school systems are very unscientific in their treatment of this problem. He says:

"When a man like Professor Ennis, who has been traveling all over the country with a temporary fake cure for stuttering, persuades the superintendents to form classes in the public schools for a few weeks' duration, and advertises extensively in the newspapers for private pupils; and when a little temporary improvement has arrived, *then* procures certificates from the superintendents heartily approving of his work, and after collecting all his fees, he vanishes to another part of the country, only to have his apparent cures relapse and be as bad as ever, soon after his departure, one begins to think that the schools should become scientific; that superintendents should follow the advice of those who know; that men really trained in the cure of speech defects by scientific well-established methods should be the ones to be consulted in this matter. Again, where lay methods of treatment are adopted from one school as a private system that is contrary to the findings of science, it is time for those schools to wake up; and also seek those who know."

The author is of the opinion that the field (of speech defects) as a whole divides naturally into three parts, phonetic defects, stuttering, and special work for special classes.

1. "Phonetic defects. Phonetic defects should be attacked in the school curriculum at an early period. I think the earlier the better. The pupil, on his first entrance to the school régime, should be phonetically examined, otherwise if allowed to pass up two, three, or four classes, as is sometimes the method of procedure, there is frequently much lack in getting knowledge; and lack of power to communicate, which leads to backwardness in the grades. I should, therefore, propose that the elimination of the phonetic defects be placed down in the first year of the primary school.

2. Stuttering. This speech defect usually occurs later in life, and therefore later in the school curriculum than the ordinary phonetic defects; and therefore must be attacked at a different time in the school programme. These cases need isolation, while phonetic cases can be treated in their ordinary class relationship. A stuttering case also needs much more time, more prolonged attention and careful watching. It is thus in many ways an entirely different problem from that of the simple phonetic defect. I should propose, therefore, that all stutterers be isolated from all classes and put together by themselves, and also separated from the phonetic defects. This paper does not propose to

deal with the management of the treatment, but simply with the management of the problem. The details of treatment, and recommendations for training for these different classes, may be found in publications and Summer Courses on this subject. I propose at this time merely to cover the ground as to the management of the problem outside of the mere treatment.

As far as the stuttering cases, then, are concerned, I should isolate them from their own classes and from the classes of phonetics, and I should place them by themselves for a systematic investigation and training along modern, scientific, and psychological lines.

3. Special Class Defects. Teachers all know that the word "special" is merely a lay term to cover any sort of mental defect from idiocy, imbecility, feeble-mindedness, moral and mental delinquency, down through the various forms of the prodigy and the "exceptional child." The special class, then, while it naturally excludes all the simple phonetic disorders, as well as the stuttering cases (that are otherwise normal mentally) it does *include* a hodgepodge of mental variations which make a very complicated problem."

Under "The Rôle of the Physician," he says:

"The ordinary school doctor knows little or nothing of the modern exhaustive field of speech defects. His knowledge is slight as to the diagnostic significance of speech disorders. His knowledge is almost nil as regards the treatment in the modern scientific and psychological sense of not only the most common, but also the rarest of the speech defects. I have never seen any physician who knew more than a tenth of what was written ten years ago; and I have never seen anyone who knows what has been written in the last ten years, who has specialized at all abroad, or has studied under more than one specialist in his own country; besides this, they are usually neither psychologists, elocutionists, neurologists, nor psychopathologists. From all these fields, the expert speech specialist draws his knowledge to make it complete. Anyone can see, then, how inadequate to the speech problem is the ordinary school physician when so many spheres of knowledge must be combined in one head to adequately approach the speech disorder problem."

The author's conclusions are as follows:

"1. Because the ordinary school physician is untrained for the special demand of medical speech expert, I would propose that the head and guiding medical element in the speech problem should be a thoroughly trained medical speech inspector.

"2. Because of frequent faulty diagnosis; and because much time and effort is wasted in treatment by lay individuals when diagnoses

are unknown; I propose that *every speech case* in the public schools be first examined by the medical speech inspector; and assigned by him to the proper class.

"3. Because the speech problem naturally divides itself into three distinct parts; I propose that the pupils be divided into phonetic, stuttering, and special class departments.

"4. Because each of these departments demands entirely different and quite exhaustive training along one individual line; I propose that separate teachers be separately trained to do the vocal drill of these departments; and that they be not allowed to undertake any vocal drill in another department.

In brief, the management of the speech defect problem in the public schools demands a medical speech inspector to see all pupils and assign them to either a phonetic, stuttering, or a special class, and to have at the head of each of these divisions a teacher specially trained in one of these lines alone."

THE UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN SPEECH CLINIC. By SMILEY BLANTON, M.D., *The Journal of Educational Psychology*, May, 1916. This article gives a clear statement of what has been done in the public speaking department of the University of Wisconsin, under the direction of Dr. Blanton, to investigate and remove speech defects.

141 persons were treated, including eight members of the faculty. The work of the clinic may be divided into four parts:

1. Treatment for poor voices.
2. Treatment for vocal defects.
3. Treatment for speech defects.
4. Training teachers for speech correction work.

"Any student in the University may receive treatment at the clinic. Each student treated has his history taken, and is given a thorough medical examination of nose, throat and larynx. Through the kind coöperation of the medical department of the university, the speech clinic is permitted to make use of the medical building and its facilities for examination; and where knowledge of the student's general health is needed, it can be easily obtained by referring to the medical department's examination sheet of the case. The relation of the work in the speech clinic to mental tests is suggested by the following: "The treatment of stuttering consists of psycho-analysis and suggestion, supplemented by vocal exercises which are based on physiological laws and planned so as to train the three fundamental parts of the vocal mechan-

ism,—the diaphragm, the vocal chords, and the articulative organs. Each stutterer is given an association test, under standard conditions, consisting of Jung's list of one hundred words supplemented by twenty words I have added."

"The most important work of the clinic, however, is not treating adults with vocal or speech disorders, but consists of training teachers for corrective speech work, who may go out in the schools of the state."

"The State of Wisconsin has already made provision for training the children with speech disorders, and now there are eight cities in the state that have teachers for this work. It has been very hard to find properly trained teachers, but the speech clinic hopes to train enough teachers to supply the demand here in Wisconsin and perhaps in other states as well. During the last year four teachers were trained in the speech correction work; during the summer session twelve teachers who graduated from the training school for teachers of the deaf, registered in the teachers' course. Ten of these are now teaching in the Wisconsin schools."

SPEECH AND VOICE HYGINE. A Symposium. *The Journal of Ophthalmology, Otology, and Laryngology*, Vol. 22, No. 4, April, 1916, by an arrangement with the committee on American Speech of the National Council of Teachers of English, devoted its entire issue to a symposium on Voice and Speech. Space does not permit us to give a detailed review of this entire journal. The character of the matter in it is sufficiently indicated by the full list of titles and authors which we give here:

Editorials: *American Voice and Speech*; *The New Americanism*, Burton Haseltine. *The Reformation of American Speech*, John M. Clapp, M.A.—*The Vocal Apparatus in Health and Disease*, George B. Rice, M.D.—*Voice Hygiene*, Joseph C. Beck, M.D.—*The Relation of Mouth Formation to Voice and Speech*, Frederick Bogue Noves, D.D.S.—*Speech Defects in Children*, Smiley Blanton, M.D.—*The Voice in Singing and in Speech*, Shirley M. K. Gandell, M. A.—*Speech and the Community*, Fred Newton Scott, Ph.D.—*The School's Function in Speech Improvement*, James E. McDade, M.A.—*American Speech and the Stage*, Otis Skinner—*Speech Training for Business Life*, William Bachrach—*Operators' Voices, Their Importance and the Method of Their Cultivation*, John W. Bradshaw—*The Telephone Operator's Throat*, LeRoy Thompson, M.D.—*Speech Training in Commercial Life*, Marshall Field & Company—*A New Era in Voice Study*, Burton Haseltine, M.D.

The issue contains in all eighty-four large pages, very well illustrated. The whole symposium has been re-printed, and copies of the reprint can be obtained from the Nelson-Schram Co., 14 Devereux St., Utica, N. Y. —twenty-five cents each.

SUBJECTS OF INTEREST

TO SOME the *New Republic* is anathema. Personally we would like to require every student to read it, and would like someone to devise a method to prove that it had been read and read intelligently.

But none of us are so narrow as to deny that good can come out of Nazareth. For many who labor with our common, ever-present problem of finding or suggesting subjects for arguments, expositions, discussion, debates, etc., here is a veritable gold mine of spicy up-to-dateness that should help solve the problem at least for this fall. This budget of subjects is published in the *New Republic* of April 1st, under the caption *A Catechism for Presidential Candidates*. It appears unsigned. We print it entire, by permission, with many thanks.

A. M. DRUMMOND.

Cornell University

A. *American policy during the war.*

1. Have you been in favor of an embargo on munitions?
2. Would you have exerted greater pressure upon Great Britain to compel her to reform the so-called blockade?
3. Would you have sent the "strict accountability" note to Germany? If not, what would you have done? If yes, would you have been in favor of any action to secure guaranties from Germany during the time between the war-zone proclamation and the sinking of the *Lusitania*?
4. If you were in favor of such action did you say so at the time, and when?
5. Would you have broken off diplomatic relations after the sinking of the *Lusitania*?
6. Would you have used any measure of reprisal, or would you have declared war?
7. If not, has there been any incident since the *Lusitania* which in your opinion required the rupture of relations or a declaration of war?

8. Do you think that the United States was under a moral obligation to protest at the violation of Belgium?
 9. If you do, when did you first begin to think so, and what was your first public utterance on the question?
 10. Do you think that the United States should have taken any action in regard to the violation of the Hague conventions in such matters as the bombardment of undefended towns? If so, what action, and when did you make your first public utterance in regard to it?
- B. *American foreign policy.*
1. Do you believe it will be necessary for the United States in the near future to come to a definite understanding with some European Power? If so, with which Power?
 2. Do you approve of the President's Pan-American policy, which provides for a guaranty of territorial integrity under a republican form of government in all the states of this hemisphere?
 3. Do you think the United States has or can expect to have sufficient military force to undertake this responsibility alone?
 4. Have you agreed in general with the President's Mexican policy? If not, would you have recognized Huerta?
 5. Would you have intervened at any time since the fall of Huerta? At what time would you have intervened?
 6. Are you in favor of the Haitian protectorate?
 7. Are you in favor of the Nicaraguan treaty?
 8. Are you in favor of the original Colombian treaty?
 9. Do you favor the abandonment of the Philippines? If so, under what conditions?
 10. Do you think the United States ought to take any action to preserve the integrity of China?
- C. *Preparedness.*
1. On what standard do you base your estimate of the navy which the United States ought to have? That is, what considerations ought to determine our naval policy in respect to Great Britain, Germany and Japan?
 2. Do you favor universal military service?
 3. Do you favor an increase of the standing army? If so, by what standard do you estimate the size needed?
 4. Do you believe in the "federalization" of the militia?
 5. Do you favor the creation of a national council of defense to coördinate all forms of naval and military preparedness?

6. Do you favor the government manufacture of certain essential munitions of war?
7. Are you prepared to abolish useless navy yards and army posts and to undertake the radical reorganization of the administrative control of national armaments?
8. How would you pay for preparedness? Would you issue bonds, lay excise duties, or protective duties, or increase income taxes and establish a federal inheritance tax?
9. Do you believe that the government should control and regulate foreign trade and investment so as to define its responsibilities in regard to the protection of them? If so, what form would this organization and control take?

D. *Domestic policy.*

1. Do you favor further restriction of immigration? If so, what form should the restriction take?
2. Are you in favor of a general revision of the tariff by the next Congress?
3. Do you favor a tariff board?
4. Do you favor the nationalization of railroads?
5. Do you favor increased administrative control of business or a more rigorous enforcement of the Sherman act and the Clayton act?
6. Are you in favor of the Shields Water Power bill?
7. Do you believe in the principle that protection should be withdrawn from an industry which does not pay a living wage to its workmen?
8. Do you think steps should be taken towards a national control of education?
9. Do you favor the principle of social insurance against sickness, accident, old age, maternity and unemployment?
10. Are you in favor of a national system of labor exchanges?
11. Do you believe in the principle of minimum wage for sweated industries?
12. Do you believe in the federal regulation of child labor?
13. Do you believe in the establishment of a permanent industrial commission to inquire into all important labor disturbances?
14. Do you believe there are any steps the federal government can take to give labor a greater representation in the management of industry?

15. Do you favor federal incorporation?
16. Do you believe that the fixing of wages on common carriers should be added to the rate-making power of the national government?
17. Do you favor government-owned ocean shipping, or a policy of shipping subsidies?
18. Are you in favor of the adoption by Congress of a budget system? If so, should it be prepared by the administration or by Congress? Should Congress be allowed to increase the items in a budget prepared by the administration?
19. Are you in favor of making the higher federal administrative officials, such as postmasters, internal revenue officers and the like, permanent appointees?
20. Do you approve of permitting individual senators to veto presidential appointments?
21. Do you believe in equal suffrage? Are you in favor of a constitutional amendment as the means of obtaining it?

NEW BOOKS

Chief European Dramatists. Selected and edited by BRANDER MATTHEWS. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1916. Cloth, pp. 786. \$2.75.

In this volume, to quote the introduction, an "attempt has been made to select, out of the drama of the remoter past and out of the drama of other tongues than English, a group of plays, tragic and comic, which might illustrate and illuminate the development of dramatic literature from the Greek of the fifth century B.C. to the Scandinavian of the end of the nineteenth century A.D." The editor gives us here the twenty-one dramas (translated into English, of course) which seem to him most significant for the purpose above set forth. The appendix contains a brief biographical paragraph on each author represented, brief notes on the plays, and a useful reading list in European dramatists.

In common with all compilations this book offers an opportunity for discussion as to whether or not the proper choice has been made from the material available here all the plays to be found in the non-English European drama of the past twenty-four centuries. We have in this volume the choice of Professor Matthews—somewhat qualified, he tells us, by such exigencies as the limits of a single volume, the availability of satisfactory translations, etc. Whether this selection just suits one or not, this book seems beyond all question to be the best one volume library of the world's drama that has ever been published.

The following are the plays given: *Agamemnon*, Aeschylus; *Aedipus*, *The King*; Sophocles; *Medea*, Euripides; *The Frogs*, Aristophanes; *The Captives*, Plautus; *Phormio*, Terence; *The Star of Seville*, Lope de Vega; *Life is a Dream*, Calderon; *The Cid*, Corneille; *Tartuffe*, Molière; *Phaedra*, Racine; *The Barber of Seville*, Beaumarchais; *Hernani*, Victor Hugo; *The Son-in-Law of M. Poirier*, Augier and Sandeau; *The Outer Edge of Society*, Alexandre Dumas fils; *The Mistress of The Inn*, Goldoni. *Minna von Barnheim*, Lessing; *Goetz von Berlichingen*, Goethe; *William Tell*, Schiller; *Rasmus Montanus*, Holberg; *A Doll's House*, Henrik Ibsen.

J. M. O'N.

A Handbook of American Speech. By CALVIN L. LEWIS, Chicago: Scott, Foresman, and Co., 1916. Cloth, pp. 246. \$0.80.

The first question that came to mind upon noting the title of this book was, "Just what phase of the subject is the author going to bear down upon? The title is very comprehensive. What does it include in this instance?" And now that the book is read, no light as to the choice of this title seems to be shed. The preface opens with a notice of a revival of interest in Oral English, and promises by implication a treatment of that subject in the ensuing text. Yet we cannot but commend the author for not using that term for a title; for if there is any term more meaningless and undenotative of anything real than Oral English, we do not know where to find it. "American Speech" does fairly well as a new turn in titles, though it is somewhat puzzling at the start.

The book proves to be a general summary of phonetics, elocution, and speech-composition. The principal adverse criticism to be offered centers around this encyclopaedic sweep of the text. It may be a mistaken notion, but it seems that the profession of teaching public speaking needs to wake up, or it will stultify itself and its career by giving out the impression that it can all be tucked snugly under one tent—main show, menagerie, side show, cooking outfit, and ticket wagon. We are firmly of the opinion that any text that aims to present phonetics, voice training, elocution, expression, debate, extempore speaking, and speech composition in one book is making two mistakes: first, it necessarily gives only a cursory treatment of some of these subjects, and so makes the book anything but a contribution to them, and, secondly, it gives the impression that teaching public speaking is a pretty simple and relatively unimportant matter. "American Speech" covers in scope, ground enough for ten year-hours of college work, but it merely skims the surface. Hence we take exception to the author's statement that "the Handbook is suitable for use in any beginning class, whether of college freshman, high school students, or pupils of upper elementary grades." To the two last-named of these it is suited; but we cannot recommend it for college students. It is too casual, too cursory; it lacks bone and sinew. It does not go down to causes and does not offer reasons. A college text ought to explain why and how; this book is short on *why*.

But for schools it has many good points. Particularly can it be useful in centers of foreign population. The chapter on phonetics is the best that has been issued in many years. Most teachers of this phase of speaking do not feel the need of teaching just how each vowel and con-

sonant ought to be made, and some will shudder at the pictures; but there is much in the way of helpful advice and an excellent set of exercises. The discussion of elocutionary rudiments in Chapter IV is very sensible, and ought to be helpful to instructors as well as students. As Mr. Lewis has proclaimed in his preface that he is writing as much to help teachers as pupils, he can be said to have carried out his intent in this particular. The chapters on Speaking in Public, Oral Composition, and Argument are so cursory that they help heighten the impression, noted above, that public speaking is a side issue that ought not concern us deeply. The illustrative material is unusually well chosen; it is a very choice collection of compositions. The fact that they appear without authors cited, is frankly explained by Mr. Lewis in the preface.

Readers of this review may be interested to know that this book has been the subject of a review in *The Dial*,** by Wallace Rice. We cannot agree with Mr. Rice in his strictures upon the inadequacy of Mr. Lewis' own speech. We think Mr. Lewis has made his case concerning the use of the terminal *r* in American speech. Mr. Rice approves of the dropping of the *r*, and cites actors, orators, statesmen, and publicists generally to argue from their speech that inasmuch as they drop the *r*, therefore American speech is more or less slovenly if it brings the terminal *r* into play. He objects to the notion that some people consider the dropping of the *r* an affectation, contending that the elect never raise this protest; it comes only from the middle class and the uneducated. Of course the slurring of the *r* is not necessarily a mark of affectation; yet when one desires to *appear* affected, one has but to drop his "ahs," and one gets the effect about as quickly as in any way possible. To cite the stage and the rostrum as inviolable models of American speech is to beg the question involved in the term "American Speech"; for the stage and the rostrum most palpably are slaves in their imitation of *English* speech. Obviously if there is any point at all in using the two terms American Speech and English Speech, there must be a difference in their respective sounds and usages. This we conceive to be Mr. Lewis' point, which Mr. Rice seems to have overlooked. We simply assert that in our opinion Mr. Lewis has made his case. (See p. 38 in the text.)

C. H. W.

The Brief: With Selections for Briefing. By CARROLL LEWIS MAXCY.
Boston: Houghton, Mifflin Company, 1916. Cloth, pp. 332. \$1.25
Professor Maxcy has prepared a very clear and very attractive book limited to this one specific problem in argumentation. His dis-

*For July 15, 1916. p. 58.

cussion of forty-two pages is admirably done. It seems to me to be quite the best explanation available of the brief as conceived by Baker and those following closely in Baker's footsteps. Following the discussion of the argumentative brief, comes specimen briefs legal and argumentative, examples of faulty briefing, and then 236 pages of selections for briefing. This collection, consisting of editorials and public speeches, contains an ample and well-assorted store of "laboratory material." Good laboratory material is about as necessary in teaching argumentation as in teaching biology—all thorough-going courses need lots of it. I know of no other single volume containing so much that is good.

Altogether *The Brief* is a book which in "matter, form and style" ought to receive a cordial welcome and render genuine service.

J. M. O'N.

The Essentials of Effective Gesture. By JOSEPH A. MOSHER, A.M., Ph.D.
New York; Macmillan Co., 1916. Cloth, pp. VII+188. \$1.00.

This book contains five parts, having the following headings: (1) The nature and technic of gesture, (2) Positions and forms of the hand, with their general meaning, (3) The scope of gestures analyzed and exemplified, (4) Acquiring facility in gesture, (5) Selections for analysis and delivery.

Gesture, according to this author, includes "any posture or movement of the head, face, body, limbs, or hands, which aids the speaker in conveying his message by appealing to the eye" (p. 3). One may question the wisdom of including postures of the body and facial expression in the meaning of gesture.

The preface says, "It is generally admitted that good gestures help to vitalize, illuminate, and emphasize verbal expression." The meaning of this is not clear. Does verbal expression mean the words or the whole expression, including both words and gestures?

The author's method of analysis seems to lead to "teaching specific gestures," which he objects to in his preface.

His statement that general principles should be emphasized gives the reader an anticipation which is only meagerly realized when the book is read through. Almost all of the things discussed seem to be matters of technique.

What Dr. Mosher means by his statement that the book is "for students of public speaking" is not easily discovered. Are the students referred to those who are learning to speak, or those who are studying

the speaking of others, or those who are teaching public speaking? One may question whether teachers of public speaking who are at all familiar with the literature of their subject will find anything new in this book. Students making a scientific study of speaking will not find much for them here. Those who are learning to speak will find the suggestions given much more mechanical than is now approved by many progressive teachers.

The mechanical view, however, is transcended in some passages, such as: "they (gestures) are as organic a part of our intercommunication as is speech." "Any gesture, therefore, which attracts attention to itself will defeat its own purpose." "Furthermore, it is to be observed that many passages may be equally well expressed in various ways, depending upon the purpose of the speaker or his particular interpretation in any given case."

But imagine the effect upon the learner if he takes such suggestions as these seriously: "It is desirable that the student give definite and thoughtful consideration to his gestures"; "The speaker should, first, never appear to be conscious of his own movements"; (Would this be practicing slight of hand or deception?); "After memorizing the piece and writing it out in manuscript, look it over carefully, to ascertain where gestures may be used to aid in effective presentation, at the same time determining exactly the ideas which the gestures are to express, and underscoring the passages, with the appropriate gestures in abbreviation. The next step in preparation is to speak the selection, trying out the gestures chosen, or making changes in the manuscript in case the actual delivery suggests improvement. Finally, deliver the speech, following scrupulously the corrected manuscript" (p. 60).

Where can one find the rules referred to in the statement on page 81, which says, "The rules governing the technic of the art are fairly well established and should be essentially adhered to?"

Part V, "Selections for Analysis and Delivery," occupies 106 pages of the book. The selections are from "the familiar writings of standard authors" and are divided into four groups: A, Narrative, B, Descriptive, C, Expository and Argumentative, D, Poetry. There are six selections in prose in each of the first three groups and nine selections in verse in the last group.

The author is to be highly commended for selecting literature of high quality. The excerpts are good examples of the kind of composition chosen. They are likewise suggestive of "the wealth and variety of interesting speaking material" abounding in good literature. A closer

inspection of any individual selection, however, reveals such incompleteness in thought and incident as to prevent its use except as something to practice on in the classroom, or to use in a critical discourse.

These selections, good as they seem from the point of view of literature, do not seem appropriate for the study of gesture. We think of gesture as closely associated with acting, but fifty pages of this Part are occupied with his two groups, Narrative and Descriptive, wherein there is little of a dramatic kind. The last group, Poetry, contains much that would demand action and gesture. Here, however, the general difficulty of the task would seem insurmountable. Browning is not easy for any one to interpret, and Kipling is sometimes difficult. There seems to be a fundamental error in the mind of the author as to the function of action, or gesture, as he calls it. Action does not merely say over again what the words have said; action says something else. In short, words, vocal modulations, and action are three independent, but frequently coöperating modes of expression.

B. G.

J. G.

Complete Guide to Public Speaking. Compiled and edited by GRENVILLE KLEISER. New York: Funk and Wagnalls Co., 1915. Cloth, pp. XV+639.

In this volume of encyclopedic dimensions, Mr. Kleiser has undoubtedly made a genuine contribution to the library of the speech arts. The six hundred and thirty-nine pages of the book are taken up with quotations from "authorities upon public speaking, oratory, preaching, platform and pulpit delivery, voice building and management, argumentation, debate, reading, rhetoric, expression, gesture, composition, etc." The authorities range from Quintilian and Cicero down to Baker, Alden, Kleiser and others: about ninety in all.

The material of the book is placed under topical headings which are arranged alphabetically. The contents are rendered highly accessible by an index which is thorough-going and complete. "Appended to each extract, with a few unavoidable exceptions, will be found the name of the author, the title of the book from which the extract has been taken, the name or the publisher and the date of publication." Thus the book puts one in touch with the source of all the material and furnishes the reader with a valuable bibliography together with the information as to where source books may be obtained.

It is to be regretted that the compilation has not been brought down to date. There are many present day contributors to the sum of knowledge in the field, who have been neglected to the detriment of the work. There are, of course, some sins of inclusion as well as those of exclusion. It would seem to the reviewer that the author would not have seriously harmed the book by cutting down the number of extracts taken from his own works. As it stands, Mr. Kleis given himself more attention, relatively, than he really deserves.

The book has a most excellent preface set down under the caption, *The Art of Public Speaking*. Here within the compass of less than eight pages the author gives the student some good warning and advice, which although not original, can at least well bear such repetition.

A. T. W.

AMERICA FIRST. By J. L. MCBRIEN. New York: American Book Company, 1916. Cloth, pp. 288. \$0.65.

America First is an illustrated volume of patriotic readings, both poetry and prose. It contains some of the finest patriotic selections to be found in American oratory, and the selections cover our entire national history from George Washington to Woodrow Wilson. The poetry also is all American patriotic poetry, and includes selections from Thomas Paine to James Whitcomb Riley. Perhaps the most interesting part of the volume is a dramatization of the Continental Congress by Mr. McBrien. Here in four acts the author has given in dramatic form the story of the Continental Congress and the Declaration of Independence. All of the historic characters are represented, and most of the well-known speeches of Henry, Adams, and the others, are put into the mouths of various characters. Mr. McBrien has deliberately taken certain liberties with history, such for instance as putting part of Webster's supposed speech of John Adams into the mouth of Benjamin Franklin. But the whole thing is very well worked out, and presents a large amount of the best American oratory dealing with the stirring times here dealt with. This little play ought to offer an admirable opportunity for a mighty good lesson in American history, and considerable excellent practice in declamation.

The book ought to be very useful, indeed, to teachers who are looking for good material for declamatory work, and to those who wish good patriotic prose or poetry for ordinary reading.

J. M. O'N.

"*The Tonsil and Its Uses.*" By RICHARD B. FAULKNER, M.D., Philadelphia: The Blanchard Company, 1916. Paper, pp. 29. \$1.00.

This book is the second by the same author dealing with the tonsils and their relation to speech and song. The author endeavors to show that the tonsils through their structure and position play an important part in the use of the voice. He says, "That the faucial tonsil is a mechanical organ, and plays an important rôle in the mechanism of speech and song, is not to be doubted, but must hereafter, be accepted as a matter of fact. Its mechanical utility is readily demonstrable, and as a mechanical organ of unique importance the faucial tonsil commands attention" (p. 8).

The tonsils are placed between two muscles that stretch down across the back of the mouth cavity that are called anterior and posterior pillars. Dr. Faulkner says that: "The tonsils assist in regulating the action of the faucial pillars; they support and modify; they give exactitude and perfection to the movements of the pillars. Toneless is the violin without the bridge. Artistically toneless is the faucial arch without the faucial tonsils. They support the tone by supporting the arch. They are an absolute necessity in the support of the arch in the modulation of the voice in crescendo and decrescendo. They soften the tone.—They give to the timbre its *personal* quality, its *charm*, its *precious value*.—After its removal there is *always a permanent loss* in its *personal quality and personal charm*; *always a loss in sweetness in tone quality*; the tone seems *dispersed*; *it loses in clearness, exercise, color, and facility*; *it lacks the usual brilliancy of resonance*; *crescendo and diminuendo are always affected and most often impossible*; . . . nasal tone common" (pp. 8-9).

Mme. Cappiani is quoted as saying that: "The most beautiful voices have large tonsils" (p. 10).

Authorities are quoted to show that children with large tonsils show most resistance to disease; and that they are (the tonsils) never sources of infection as there is little or no absorption from the tonsil. He says: "All the diseases which have been attributed to their presence, as a matter of course exist, but have nothing to do with them. Stupidity, retarded and impaired mental faculties, rheumatism, heart disease, frog face, pigeon-breast, and so forth, require some other explanation than the presence of tonsils" (p. 23). In conclusion the author holds, "Upon the facts presented in this treatise, I trust that hereafter the vocal, mechanic, and physiologic functions will become more clearly recognized and the tonsil more respected, protected, and preserved" (p. 24).

Most of the physicians who specialize in the diseases of the nose and throat, as well as those who are engaged in training the voice either in singing or speaking, will agree with Dr. Faulkner that it is well to preserve the tonsils as long as possible. The removal of the tonsils without good cause is to be condemned. And it is true that there are some specialists who operate on the tonsils without sufficient cause. On the other hand, there are few specialists who hold that the tonsils never become so diseased that removal is necessary. Nor do most teachers find the bad results from the removal of the tonsils that are pointed out in the book. It would seem that a middle course for the teachers of voice were the wisest. Be as conservative concerning the removal of the tonsils as possible, but when they are obviously diseased have them removed.

Dr. Faulkner's monograph is interesting, and we hope that it will stimulate others to investigate the functions of the tonsils and their relation to the quality of the tone, and the use of the voice. Dr. Faulkner is an extremist, however, and his conclusions differ so with the opinions and experience of the great majority of physicians, that they cannot be accepted without much more proof than he has given in this book.

S. B.